

MAY 10 1938

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.

THE  
SOUTH CAROLINA  
HISTORICAL AND GENEALOGICAL  
MAGAZINE



PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE  
SOUTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL SOCIETY  
CHARLESTON, S. C.

---

VOLUME XXXIX, No. 2

---

APRIL, 1938

Entered at the Post-office at Charleston, S. C., as  
Second-Class Matter

*Made in United States of America*

*PUBLICATION COMMITTEE*

THEODORE D. JERVEY

A. S. SALLEY

J. H. EASTERBY

*EDITOR OF THE MAGAZINE*

MABEL L. WEBBER

---

**CONTENTS**

Castle Pinckney . . . . .	51
Gov. Draytons Contribution to Geography . . . . .	68
Gaillard Notes . . . . .	72
Dupré Records . . . . .	81
Loyalists Revolutionary Claim . . . . .	82
Elfe Account Book . . . . .	83
Marriage and Death Notices . . . . .	91
Journal of General Peter Horry . . . . .	96
Grave Stones from Marion County . . . . .	100
Bible of John Maynard Davis . . . . .	102

N.B.—These Magazines, with the exception of Vols. I and II (now out of print) are \$1.50 each. The membership fee is \$5.00 per annum (the fiscal year being from January to January). Members can buy back numbers or duplicates at \$1.25 each; they also have the free use of the Society's Library.

Any member who has not received the last number will please notify the Secretary and Treasurer

MISS MABEL L. WEBBER,  
South Carolina Historical Society,  
Library Building, King St.,  
Charleston, S. C.

# THE SOUTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL AND GENEALOGICAL MAGAZINE

VOL. XXXIX

APRIL, 1938

No. 2

## CASTLE PINCKNEY, SILENT SENTINEL OF CHARLESTON HARBOR

By ROGERS W. YOUNG

(Continued from January)

November and December, 1860 were crucial months for Castle Pinckney. With the secession of South Carolina obviously imminent, the United States began to take measures to protect and hold the fortifications in Charleston Harbor. Reporting on the condition of Castle Pinckney, the Assistant Adjutant-General, on November 11, 1860, noted that while "its armament is complete," it was ungarrisoned and required repairs to the quarters and magazine. He also stated that "while a small force under an officer would secure it against surprize," he "would not recommend its occupation."<sup>57</sup> Increasing unrest in Charleston soon convinced Major Robert Anderson, commanding the United States troops there, that Castle Pinckney should be prepared for immediate occupation. On November 23, he reported that "Castle Pinckney . . . perfectly commanding the city of Charleston," required a few repairs, and strongly recommended its immediate occupation by a garrison, or at least, by a repair party "if the Government determines to keep command of this harbor." He then believed it apparent that South Carolina would leave the Union and seize the harbor fortifications, observing that "Castle Pinckney, being

<sup>57</sup> F. J. Porter, Assistant Adjutant-General to Colonel S. Cooper, Adjutant-General, November 11, 1860, in O. R., Ser. I, I, p. 72.

so near the city, and with no one in it but an ordnance sergeant, they [the South Carolinians] regard as already in their possession.<sup>58</sup> Three days later the War Department authorized Captain J. G. Foster, Corps of Engineers, at Charleston, to send a working party under an Engineer Officer to make the necessary repairs at Castle Pinckney.<sup>59</sup> On December 3, Lieutenant J. C. Davis and twenty laborers were placed in the work, ten additional laborers arriving next day.<sup>60</sup> Lieutenant R. K. Meade relieved Lieutenant Davis on December 11, and continued repair operations until South Carolina took possession of the work on December 27, 1860.<sup>61</sup>

South Carolina formally seceded from the Union on December 20, 1860, and within a week, Major Anderson's fears, as to South Carolina's intentions regarding Castle Pinckney, were justified. On December 26, Major Anderson abandoned Fort Moultrie and occupied Fort Sumter.<sup>62</sup> South Carolina then acted swiftly to prevent further occupation of Charleston fortifications by United States forces. About the mid-afternoon of the next day, December 27

"... a detachment of the First Regiment Rifles, South Carolina Militia, consisting of the Washington Light Infantry, Captain C. H. Simonton, the Carolina Light Infantry, Captain B. G. Pinckney, and the Meagher Guard, Captain Ed. McCrady, Jr., under the command of Colonel J. J. Pettigrew and Major Ellison Capers, proceeded . . . to Railroad Accommodation Wharf, where the battalion embarked on the steamer *Nina*; landing at Castle Pinckney, the command scaled the walls with ladders and took possession of the fort, which was occupied at the time by a working party under Lieut. Meade, United States Army."<sup>63</sup>

Lieutenant Meade made no resistance, and he and the workmen were allowed to leave for Fort Sumter later in the afternoon.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>58</sup> Major Robert Anderson to Colonel S. Cooper, November 23, 1860, in O. R., Ser. I, I, pp. 75-76.

<sup>59</sup> O. R. Ser. I, I, pp. 77-78.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 78, 84-86.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4, 90-91, 109, 179.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 2.

<sup>63</sup> *Charleston Centennial*, p. 163. This source gives the hour of the occupation to have been shortly after 4:30 P.M., while O. R., Ser. I, I, p. 109 gives the hour as "about 4 o'clock [P.M.]"

<sup>64</sup> O. R., Ser. I, I, pp. 3-4, 109, 179.

Castle Pinckney was in excellent condition at the time of its seizure. Its armament, which was "all mounted, except two or three guns on the barbette tier, and one 42-pounder in the casemate tier," included: "fourteen, 24-pounders, four, 42-pour [sic] rs, four, 8-inch seacoast howitzers, one 10-inch and one 8-inch mortar, and four light [artillery] pieces for flank defence," a total of twenty-eight pieces. The gun "carriages were [then] in good order, and pretty good," while the "magazine was well furnished with implements, and also contained some powder."<sup>65</sup> However, with the exception of Major Robert Anderson, Castle Pinckney was not then regarded in military circles as an important fortification. Since the work was located only a mile from Charleston, Major Anderson regarded it as "perfectly commanding the city," and, in his opinion, "it was essentially important that this castle be immediately occupied" in order to hold Charleston.<sup>66</sup> Colonel, later General Q. A. Gillmore, United States Corps of Engineers, who conducted the Federal sieges of Fort Pulaski and the Charleston forts, then considered Castle Pinckney to be "an old-fashioned work" of such small importance that even "its armament was not heavy at the opening of the war."<sup>67</sup> Captain, later Major John Johnson, a Confederate engineer officer on the staff of General G. T. Beauregard, presented the viewpoint of the South Carolinians in 1861, regarding their prize, when he later stated that Castle Pinckney "was then a complete little casemated work of that period, but on so small a scale and so near the city as to be of little value in the defense of the harbor."<sup>68</sup>

While tension increased at Charleston, early in 1861, the South Carolinians were engaged busily in reorganizing their defenses of the harbor, including certain changes in the armament of Castle Pinckney. Colonel J. J. Petigrew, who had commanded the South Carolina troops which occupied Castle Pinckney on December 27, 1860, remained in charge of the fortification until January, 1861, when he was succeeded by a Captain Baker of the First South

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 4, 75, 129-130, and 179; cf., *Am. St. Pa., Mil. Aff.*, V, pp. 853-856; Gillmore, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-9; John Johnson, *The Defense of Charleston Harbor . . . 1863-1865*, Charleston, S. C., 1890, p. 21; *Charleston Centennial*, p. 163.

<sup>66</sup> O. R., Ser. I, I, pp. 74-76.

<sup>67</sup> Gillmore, *op. cit.*, p. 9; O. R., Ser. I, XXVIII, Pt. I, pp. 3-4.

<sup>68</sup> Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

Carolina Regiment of Infantry.<sup>69</sup> During January Castle Pinckney remained practically "as it was when taken," except that sand bags were "placed around the parapet apparently for the purpose of protecting the heads" of the South Carolina "sharpshooters." By January 21, it had been reported to the Federal officers at Fort Sumter "that some of the guns have been taken [by the South Carolinians] from the Castle to arm the new earth batteries on Morris Island and other places."<sup>70</sup> Actually, it was not until March that seven guns with carriages, two seacoast howitzers and five twenty-four pounders, were really seen being removed from Castle Pinckney.<sup>71</sup> With the beginning of April, 1861, the uncertainty in Charleston over the possible outcome of Major Anderson's continued occupation of Fort Sumter soon precipitated a crisis. This ended abruptly when General Beauregard's batteries opened on Fort Sumter at 4:30 o'clock on the morning of April 12. Fort Sumter's guns replied in turn, mainly at the South Carolina batteries on Morris, James and Sullivan Islands, no shots being fired apparently at Castle Pinckney or the city. Early in the afternoon of April 13, Major Anderson surrendered, and agreed to evacuate Fort Sumter on the next day.<sup>72</sup> South Carolina had struck the first blow for the South. Castle Pinckney had commenced its role of an incidental participant in the only war to which it ever was to be directly exposed.

The events of the war passed lightly over Charleston and Castle Pinckney during the remainder of the year 1861. Captain Baker was succeeded as commandant of Castle Pinckney, in the spring, by Captain Joseph A. Yates, with a detachment of the First South Carolina Regiment of Artillery. Captain H. S. Farley, of the same command, appears to have succeeded Captain Yates for a brief period in the early summer.<sup>73</sup> By mid-summer a detachment of the Zouave Cadets, from a local militia company in Charleston,

<sup>69</sup> *Charleston Centennial*, p. 169.

<sup>70</sup> Captain J. G. Foster, Fort Sumter, to General J. G. Totten, Chief Engineer, January 21, 1861, in O. R., Ser., I, I, p. 147.

<sup>71</sup> Major W. H. C. Whiting, Charleston, S. C., to General G. T. Beauregard, Charleston, March 6, 1861, in O. R., Ser. I, I, pp. 27-28; cf., Captain J. G. Foster, Fort Sumter, to General J. G. Totten, Washington, March 20, 1861, in *ibid.*, pp. 209-210.

<sup>72</sup> O. R., Ser. I, I, pp. 14-15, 18-19, 305.

<sup>73</sup> *Charleston Centennial*, p. 169.

under the command of Captain C. E. Chichester, had become the permanent garrison at Castle Pinckney. Their first important detail was the guarding of Federal prisoners taken by the Confederates during the rout at First Manasses or Bull Run on July 21, 1861. The young soldiers continued this uneventful duty during the several months that Castle Pinckney was relegated temporarily to the status of a military prison.<sup>74</sup> Late in the year, the ordnance remaining at Castle Pinckney was overhauled, re-mounted and generally prepared for service.<sup>75</sup> Federal blockading operations at Charleston during December, 1861, and January, 1862, included the sinking of stone fleets in the main ship channels at the entrance to the harbor—the main war operations at Charleston during this time, these actions in no way involved Castle Pinckney.<sup>76</sup>

Throughout the year 1862 the defenses of Charleston Harbor were being reorganized and strengthened, and careful plans formulated by the Confederates to withstand the long impending Federal attack upon this strategic port. As these operations and plans developed, however, it became readily apparent that Castle Pinckney could be assigned but a secondary part in any scheme of major defense designed to protect the harbor. The first half of the year found affairs very quiet at Castle Pinckney. Captain Chichester's command of Zouave Cadets was relieved in March, 1862, by a detachment from the First South Carolina Regiment of Artillery, under Major Ormsby Blanding.<sup>77</sup> By September the armament of Castle Pinckney had been considerably reduced. Late in that month, the work mounted only ten guns, three 24 pounders in the casemates, and a barbette battery consisting of six 24 pounders and one 24 pounder rifled cannon.<sup>78</sup>

During September and October, 1862, prior to the adoption by the Confederates of a detailed defense plan for Charleston Harbor, they detailed General G. T. Beauregard to make a final and conclusive inspection of the fortifications of this valuable port. That

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 163, 169; cf., O. J. Bond, *The Story of the Citadel*, Richmond, Va. 1936, pp. 49-50.

<sup>75</sup> *Charleston Centennial*, p. 163.

<sup>76</sup> O. R., Ser. I, VI, pp. 42-44.

<sup>77</sup> *Charleston Centennial*, pp. 163, 169.

<sup>78</sup> O. R., Ser. I, XIV, pp. 605-606, 610.

he regarded Castle Pinckney to be of little value as a fortification, is obvious from his report of September 24, in which he emphatically states

"I did not visit Castle Pinckney, the armament of which is nine 24-pounders and one 24-pounder rifled, as I am acquainted already with this work, and considered it nearly worthless, capable of exerting but little influence on the defenses of Charleston."<sup>79</sup>

General Beauregard reiterated this stand regarding the military effectiveness of Castle Pinckney on October 3, and next day, when an official Confederate report was issued, describing the defense plan and the defenses of Charleston Harbor, Castle Pinckney was not even included.<sup>80</sup> About this time, Major Ormsby Blanding was relieved by Captain W. H. Perroneau, who assumed command of the one company of the First South Carolina Regiment of Artillery then garrisoning Castle Pinckney.<sup>81</sup> Late in December, 1862, when the Confederate defense plan for Charleston Harbor had finally been formulated and was issued, Castle Pinckney was definitely assigned a function in the second and third lines of defense, and in no way was to be concerned with the major defense measures of the first line of fortification.<sup>82</sup>

The first major Federal attacks upon the defenses of Charleston Harbor began in 1863, continuing throughout the year. Detailed official reports, from both Confederate and Federal commanders, fail to show Castle Pinckney actively engaged in the bloody assaults of that year, which the Federals concentrated mainly upon the outer or first line of defense. By March 13, 1863, Captain Perroneau had been succeeded by Captain H. S. Farley as commandant of Castle Pinckney. The garrison of the work consisted of Company H, First South Carolina Regiment of Artillery.<sup>83</sup> Castle Pinckney is reported to have been then "considered too small and too near the city to be counted upon for anything more than a part of second line defense."<sup>84</sup> Beginning with the abortive

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 610.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 619-620, 627.

<sup>81</sup> *Charleston Centennial*, p. 169; cf., O. R., Ser. I, XIV, p. 624.

<sup>82</sup> "Circular, Hdqs. First Mil. Dist. S. C., Ga., and Fla., Charleston, December 26, 1862," signed by Brigadier-General R. S. Ripley, commanding, in O. R., Ser. I, XIV, pp. 732-735.

<sup>83</sup> O. R., Ser. I, XIV, pp. 822-823, 929; cf., Simons, *op. cit.*, p. 63; Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-37.

<sup>84</sup> Simons, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

Federal naval attack upon Forts Sumter and Moultrie, April 7, 1863, Castle Pinckney was to be indirectly exposed to successive Federal assaults during most of the year.<sup>85</sup> As in this April engagement, the Federal descent on Morris Island, their assaults on Fort Wagner and opening bombardment of Fort Sumter, during July and August, 1863, were actions comparatively remote from Castle Pinckney, which barely received incidental mention in the official Confederate and Federal reports of these operations.<sup>86</sup> During the fall and early winter of 1863, similar attacks were continued by the Federals upon Morris Island and Forts Moultrie and Sumter, with which actions Castle Pinckney had little relation.<sup>87</sup> However, at the end of the year 1863, the work still retained the status of a defensive harbor post.<sup>88</sup> At the height of the Federal attacks upon Charleston Harbor's outer line of defense in 1863, Captain Farley had been relieved from the command of Castle Pinckney by Captain J. G. King. Captain King continued in command of the one company of the First South Carolina Regiment of Artillery garrisoning Castle Pinckney, until that force evacuated the work in the face of the Federal advance in February, 1865.<sup>89</sup>

With Fort Sumter badly shattered and other works in the Confederate first line of defense weakened or captured, the early months of 1864 found the Confederates industriously strengthening their second line of defense. By sprin<sup>r</sup>, the character of Castle

<sup>85</sup> O. R., Ser. I, XIV, pp. 240-280; cf., Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 44-56; *Report of General G. T. Beauregard of the Defence of Charleston*, Richmond, Va., 1864, pp. 6-9.

<sup>86</sup> O. R., Ser. I, XXVIII, Pt. I, pp. 3-4, 15-20, 30-39, 55-116, 199-580; cf., Gillmore, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-22; Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 76-114, 115-144; *Report of General G. T. Beauregard*—Richmond, 1864, pp. 52-56, 57-66.

<sup>87</sup> O. R., Ser. I, XXVIII, Pt. I, pp. 30-39, 116-189, 596-679; cf., Gillmore, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-22; Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 145-164, 165-185, 208.

<sup>88</sup> See "Map of Charleston and its Defences. Compiled from Surveys of portions of St. Andrews and Christ Ch. Parishes By Lieut. John Johnson C. S. Engrs . . . Charleston, S. C. November 28, 1863," between pages 352-353 in the *Year Book 1885 City of Charleston So Ca*, Charles, 1886. Accompanying an article: "Charleston and its Defences in the late 'War Between the States,' with a map showing all military posts and line of defence—1860-65," pp. 347-352, in *ibid.*, by General R. S. Ripley, former Confederate commander of the Charleston district, the Johnson map shows Castle Pinckney to have been a defensive post late in 1863.

<sup>89</sup> *Charleston Centennial*, p. 169.

Pinckney as a fortification had considerably changed. On April 6, Colonel W. W. H. Davis, Federal Commander on Morris Island, reported the Confederates to be occupied in "strengthening Castle Pinckney," stating that

"A great amount of work has been done at Castle Pinckney in the past month, but it is not yet possible to tell the object of it. There has been a large amount of sand and turf carried inside the fort, and from present appearances they have commenced a wall of sand and turf within the present wall of the fort."<sup>90</sup>

Soon the Confederates had placed

"... an embankment of earth against the scarf [scarp wall] of the sea front, thus closing the casemate embrasures and converting it [Castle Pinckney] into a barbette battery, with empaulements [emplacements] for four guns—three 10-inch columbiads and one Brooks rifle on centre pintle carriage."<sup>91</sup>

Castle Pinckney's new barbette battery was not completed in 1864, and saw no actual service in the Federal siege operations at Charleston during that year.<sup>92</sup>

The desperate but futile strengthening of Castle Pinckney continued during the Confederacy's last tragic months in early 1865. During January, 1865, heavy working parties were engaged in banking, sodding grass, and apparently in making slight changes in the positions of the guns. By the end of the month, Castle Pinckney, "from the outside," presented "all the appearance of an earthwork," and "its casemates were disarmed, its front wall covered with an exterior wall of sand, well sodded, and its ramparts furnished with merlons and traverses."<sup>93</sup>

The remodeling of Castle Pinckney was completed too late for it to be of any value to the desperate Confederate force in Charleston Harbor. Practically surrounded by an overwhelming Federal force, and with Sherman already ravaging the state, the Confederates were forced to evacuate the harbor and city of Charleston during the night and early morning of February 17 and 18,

<sup>90</sup> Colonel W. W. H. Davis, Morris Island, S. C., to Captain Adrian Terry, Assistant Adjutant-General, Northern District, Department of the South, April 6, 1864, in O. R., Ser. I, XXXV, Pt. II, pp. 39-41.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.* cf., *Charleston Centennial*, p. 163, and Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

<sup>92</sup> O. R., Ser. I, XXXV, Pt. I, pp. 1, 3-372.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, Ser. I, XLVII, Pt. I, pp. 1009-1011; cf., Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

1865.<sup>94</sup> Leaving his garrison flag proudly aloft, Captain J. G. King, in command of the one company of the First South Carolina Regiment of Artillery at Castle Pinckney, had removed his garrison under cover of darkness, along with the other Confederate forces in the harbor.<sup>95</sup> By the middle of the morning, on February 18, Lieutenant Colonel A. G. Bennett, commanding the Twenty-first United States Colored Troops, had taken possession of Fort Sumter, and he then

" . . . pushed for the city, stopping at Fort Ripley and Castle Pinckney, from which works rebel flags were hauled down and the American flag substituted. The guns in these works were in good order."<sup>96</sup>

The only war it ever actually experienced was at an end for Castle Pinckney, a war, incidentally in which it barely fired a shot. Due to its location in the inner harbor, and the weakness of its armament and garrison, Castle Pinckney had been forced to occupy a position of secondary importance throughout the war. The position and importance of Castle Pinckney in the war is well characterized by Thomas Petigru Lesesne, the historian of Charleston County, who states in his recent *Landmarks of Charleston*, that in the "War for Southern Independence, it [Castle Pinckney] lacked opportunity to contribute materially to the defence of Charleston."<sup>97</sup>

The period between 1865 and 1878 was very uneventful for Castle Pinckney. Apparently having passed under the control of the Engineer Department, United States Army, immediately following the termination of hostilities in April, 1865, the fortification had been placed under the direct supervision of Major Q. A. Gillmore,

<sup>94</sup> O. R., Ser. I, XLVII, Pt. I, pp. 1018, 1049, 1071; cf., Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 244, 256.

<sup>95</sup> *Charleston Centennial*, p. 163. The exact hour of the evacuation of Castle Pinckney could not be determined.

<sup>96</sup> Lieutenant Colonel A. G. Bennett to Captain J. W. Dickinson, Acting Assistant Adjutant General, Charleston, S. C., February 24, 1865, in O. R., Ser. I, XLVII, Pt. I, pp. 1018-1019. The guns at Castle Pinckney consisted of three 10 inch columbiads and a Brooks rifle. See O. R., Ser. I, XXXV, Pt. II, pp. 30-41; *Charleston Centennial*, p. 163; Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

<sup>97</sup> Lesesne, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

Corps of Engineers.<sup>98</sup> Late in the fall of 1869, the Chief Engineer reported that

"The works for the defense of . . . Charleston, South Carolina [including Castle Pinckney] . . . remain very much as they have for several years past. Nothing beyond some cleaning away of the rubbish has been undertaken.  
...<sup>99</sup>

In 1870 Major Gillmore recommended that Castle Pinckney be maintained in its existing condition, with moderate repairs, and that guns of medium caliber be mounted on the wooden platforms already erected.<sup>100</sup> Later he recommended the mounting of 10 inch smooth bore or rifled cannon *en barbette* at this work, but between 1870 and 1877 no operations were undertaken as no funds were available.<sup>101</sup>

A rather novel period of usefulness opened for Castle Pinckney and its reservation in 1878. While then still looked upon, by Lieutenant Colonel Gillmore, as "one of the interior works in the system of defence" of Charleston Harbor, to all intents Castle Pinckney had been abandoned for such a purpose since the close of the war.<sup>102</sup> Meanwhile, the Light House Board of the Treasury Department was seeking a convenient site in Charleston Harbor upon which to establish a light station and depot of supplies. On April 11, 1878, the Secretary of the Treasury wrote the Secretary of War requesting "that Castle Pinckney be transferred to the control of the Light House Board for use as a depot." His letter was referred to Lieutenant Colonel Gillmore, who immediately approved the plan, and on April 20, Brigadier-General A. A. Humphreys, Chief of Engineers, reported to the Secretary of War, that

<sup>98</sup> Brigadier General A. A. Humphreys, to the Secretary of War, April 20, 1878, quoted in the letter of Major W. J. Twining, Corps of Engineers, to Lieutenant Colonel Q. A. Gillmore, Corps of Engineers, May 1, 1878, File No. 159-F-1878, District United States Engineer Office, Charleston, S. C.; cf., *Report of the Secretary of War . . . Washington*, 1869, p. 16; and *Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers—Washington*, 1870, p. 23.

<sup>99</sup> "Report of the Chief of Engineers," in *Report of the Secretary of War—Washington*, 1869, p. 16.

<sup>100</sup> *Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers—Washington*, 1870, p. 23.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, 1871, p. 20; 1872, p. 17; 1874, Pt. I, p. 22; 1875, Pt. I, p. 22; 1877, Pt. I, p. 19.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, 1877, Pt. I, p. 19; 1878, Pt. I, p. 22.

"It is recommended that authority be granted to the Light House Board to use Castle Pinckney, Charleston Harbor, as a depot for buoys and other material, and to construct wharves and temporary buildings in the vicinity in such positions as may be approved by the Officer of Engineers in charge of the work. . . . It being agreed that the premises shall be vacated when required by the War Department."

The Secretary of War approved this recommendation on April 24, 1878, and on the same day notified the Secretary of the Treasury that favorable action had been taken upon the latter's request. Copies of this official correspondence were forwarded to Colonel Gillmore for his "information and guidance" on May 1.<sup>103</sup>

Soon afterwards apparently, the Light House Board began the establishment of its depot at Castle Pinckney. However, two years elapsed before the Chief of Engineers officially recognized this transfer of the reservation. His annual report for 1880, in commenting on the existing conditions at Castle Pinckney, stated that

"This work, situated on Shute's Folly Island, about one mile east of the city of Charleston, is one of the interior works in the system of defense of the harbor. . . . In its present condition it is useless for defensive purposes, and is now in charge of the Light House Board for lighthouse purposes."<sup>104</sup>

While the Corps of Engineers naturally expended no money on operations at Castle Pinckney between 1878-1884, the Light House Board appears to have been quite busy with construction at the reservation during this period.<sup>105</sup> During 1880 a new harbor light was established on the Castle Pinckney reservation. This light was placed at the end of the wharf or pierhead on the south side of the island.<sup>106</sup> By the early summer of 1884, it was reported

<sup>103</sup> This entire official correspondence is summarized in a letter written by Major W. J. Twining, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Washington, to Lieutenant Colonel Q. A. Gillmore, May 1, 1878, File No. 159-F-1878, District United States Engineer Office, Charleston, S. C.

<sup>104</sup> *Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers—Washington, 1880, Pt. I,* p. 43.

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, 1878, Pt. I, p. 22; 1879, Pt. I, p. 26; 1880, Pt. I, p. 43; 1881, Pt. I, p. 43; 1882, Pt. I, pp. 40-41; 1883, Pt. I, p. 37; and 1884, Pt. I, p. 43.

<sup>106</sup> *U. S. Department of Commerce Lighthouse Service Light List . . . Atlantic and Gulf Coasts of the United States . . . Washington, 1932*, p. 332; cf., *U. S. Department of Commerce Lighthouse Service Local Light and Buoy List . . . Cape Lookout to Dry Tortugas . . . Washington, 1936*, p. 390.

to the Corps of Engineers that two "frame buildings near the fort, one large store house and the [light] keepers dwelling," previously "completed and belonging to the Light House Dept., " were in "excellent condition," presenting a "trim appearance." A wharf, also belonging to the Light House Board, was then "in very good condition" with "16 ft. at the head at m. l. w."<sup>107</sup>

The fortification structure and the rest of the reservation, however, presented a neglected and abandoned appearance at this time. Lieutenant Thomas N. Bailey, of the district United States Engineer Office at Charleston, inspected Castle Pinckney on June 8, 1884, and two days later reported to Colonel Q. A. Gillmore that

"The fort is in a dilapidated condition; the walls have settled and cracked; there are no slopes, except accidental ones; the gun carriages have rotted away and only parts of the guns are exposed by the rubbish in which they are buried.<sup>108</sup> The roofs of the magazine have fallen in. That [part of the fort] which was the barracks is a dangerous wreck, gradually falling to pieces. A frame building, North of the Fort, believed to be Engineer Property, is unserviceable, not worth repairs, and repairs are not needed as it answers well as a wood yard and potato cellar for the Light-House Attendant.

\* \* \* \* \*

"A coat of limewash on the outside walls of the fort, might destroy its tone as an interesting ruin but would place it more in keeping with the trim appearance of the Light House Buildings."<sup>109</sup>

That the War Department had long since ceased to regard Castle Pinckney as an effective fortification worthy of maintenance is evident from Lieutenant Bailey's report, and his solicitude toward the preservation of the crumbling structure's "tone as an interesting ruin."

The status of Castle Pinckney remained unchanged throughout the movement begun by the Federal Government in 1885 to re-

<sup>107</sup> First Lieutenant Thomas H. Bailey, Corps of Engineers, Charleston, S. C., to Colonel Q. A. Gillmore, June 10, 1884, in files of District United States Engineer Office, Charleston, S. C. "M. l. w." is the abbreviation for "mean low water."

<sup>108</sup> The guns referred to were apparently the three 10 inch columbiads and the Brooks rifled cannon, which were in Castle Pinckney at the end of the War Between the States. See *Charleston Centennial*, p. 163, which states that these guns were in the work in 1883.

<sup>109</sup> Bailey to Gillmore, June 10, 1884; and Bailey to Gillmore, December 9, 1884. Both letters in the files of the District United States Engineer Office Charleston, S. C.

organize and rebuild the vast coast defense system of the United States. In 1885 the President was authorized by Congress to appoint a Board on Fortifications and other Defenses which was to make a survey of the coast defenses and to recommend improvements. This board, generally known as the Endicott Board, published its report in 1886, and pursuant to its findings, the Chief of Engineers on March 29, 1887 instructed the Board of Engineers to undertake the study and preparation of new defense projects for the principal ports of the country, including Charleston.<sup>110</sup> Meanwhile, Colonel Q. A. Gillmore, who had continued to exercise general supervision over Castle Pinckney, died, and early in 1888 was succeeded in this duty by Captain Frederic V. Abbot, Corps of Engineers.<sup>111</sup> By 1894 the Board of Engineers had prepared a project for the erection of three batteries on Sullivan's Island at Charleston, but the fortification of the rest of the harbor, including the Castle Pinckney reservation was ignored.<sup>112</sup> Two years later, however, work was commenced on the erection of a modern battery at Fort Sumter.<sup>113</sup> It was during this period of the early 1890's that the crumbling walls of Castle Pinckney were reported to have been razed to provide sufficient space for the supply depot and light station of the Light House Board.<sup>114</sup> While the Engineer Department commented upon the "bad condition" of Castle Pinckney, during this time, its official reports contain no record of the actual razing of the structure's walls.<sup>115</sup>

<sup>110</sup> *Annual Report of the War Department, . . . Part I . . .* Washington, 1897, p. 7.

<sup>111</sup> *Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers*—Washington, 1885, Pt. I, p. 36; 1886, Pt. I, p. 36; 1887, Pt. I, p. 347; 1888, Pt. I, pp. 4-5; 1889, Pt. I, pp. 8-10, 408.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, 1894, Pt. I, pp. 13, 168, 172.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, 1896, Pt. I, pp. 7, 17, 502.

<sup>114</sup> Simons, *op. cit.*, p. 66; cf., Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 91. These sources state that the walls were destroyed in order that a light station could then be built. However, the Light House Board had been in possession of the reservation since 1878, and had erected its new light there in 1880, and its buildings, by 1884, as previously noted. No record is now available of the building of a light station here in the 1890's, or of the razing of the walls for such a purpose.

<sup>115</sup> *Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers*—Washington, 1890, Pt. I, pp. 4-5, 374; 1891, Pt. I, pp. 453, 471; 1892, Pt. I, pp. 427, 444; 1893, Pt. I, pp. 491, 508-509; 1894, Pt. I, pp. 13, 168, 172; 1895, Pt. I, p. 10; 1896, Pt. I, pp. 17, 502; 1897, Pt. I, pp. 16-17; 1898, Pt. I, pp. 24-25; 1899, Pt. I, p. 26.

The Spanish-American War, which created intense excitement along the South Atlantic Coast in 1898, produced no changes at Castle Pinckney. Under the Act for National Defense of March 9, 1898, special batteries were erected at Charleston, but none was placed in Castle Pinckney. During the summer of 1898 Charleston Harbor was mined near Castle Pinckney, but early in the next year the mines were removed, having never been of use.<sup>116</sup>

Castle Pinckney since 1900 has had a rather prosaic history. In 1911 the Castle Pinckney pierhead light, which had been established in 1880, was rebuilt.<sup>117</sup> The reservation continued as a supply depot for the Lighthouse Service until January 8, 1917, when it "was abandoned" for this purpose, and "the keys of the various buildings turned over to the U. S. District Engineer Officer, Corps of Engineers, U. S. A., at Charleston, S. C."<sup>118</sup> Upon being returned to the War Department on this date, "Castle Pinckney was placed in charge of the Engineer Department, under the custody of the District Engineer at Charleston," and since that time "has been used continuously as a supply depot by the Engineer Department."<sup>119</sup>

Since 1924, Castle Pinckney, in addition to functioning mainly as a warehouse for the Engineer Department, has occupied the more dignified status of a national monument. Under the author-

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, 1898, Pt. I, pp. 24-25; 1899, Pt. I, p. 26.

<sup>117</sup> *U. S. Department of Commerce Lighthouse Service Light List . . . Atlantic and Gulf Coasts of the United States . . .* Washington, 1932, p. 332.

<sup>118</sup> See endorsement of T. H. Gregg, Superintendent, Office of Inspector, 6th District, Charleston, S. C., October 10, 1917, on bottom of letter, "Acting Commissioner," Bureau of Lighthouses, Department of Commerce, Washington, to Lighthouse Inspector, Charleston, S. C., October 9, 1917, requesting "the actual date on which the transfer [of Castle Pinckney] to the War Department was made." Letter and endorsement in the files of the Office of the Superintendent of Lighthouses, Charleston, S. C. See also "11th Ind. U.S.E.O., Charleston, S. C., Apr. 4, 1918. . . To the Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army, Thru the Division Engineer, S. E. Div., Savannah, Ga.," signed by James P. Allen, Assistant Engineer in Charge, in files of the District United States Engineer Office, Charleston, S. C. The latter letter confirms January 8, 1917, as the date of the transfer.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.* cf., Fred T. Bass, Captain, Corps of Engineers, District Engineer, Charleston, S. C., to Rogers W. Young, Junior Historian, Fort Pulaski National Monument, November 28, 1936, in files of Fort Pulaski National Monument, Savannah, Georgia.

ity of "section 2 of the act of Congress approved June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225)," President Coolidge on October 15, 1924, by proclamation declared as a national monument:

"*Castle Pinckney, Charleston Harbor, S. C.* . . . The entire reservation comprising three and one-half acres situated on Shutes Folly Island at the mouth of the Cooper River opposite the southern extremity of the city of Charleston and about one mile distant therefrom."<sup>120</sup>

Only that small portion of Shute's Folly actually in the Castle Pinckney reservation, at the higher southern point, thus became a national monument, the rest of the island remaining in private ownership.<sup>121</sup>

When established, Castle Pinckney National Monument was under the control of the War Department, which continued to supervise the area for several years.<sup>122</sup> However, soon after the beginning of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration, it was determined to consolidate under one bureau the functions of several departments having supervision over various national historic areas. Late in the summer of 1933, pursuant to Executive Order No. 6166, June 10, 1933, issued under "the authority of Section 16 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (Public No. 428-47 Stat. 1517)," and Executive Order No. 6228, July 28, 1933, Castle Pinckney National Monument, along with various other historic areas, was transferred from the War Department and placed under the supervision of the National Park Service of the United States Department of the Interior. Although still serving as a warehouse and supply depot for the Engineer Department, the Castle Pinckney National Monument is now under the control of the National Park Service, and since December 15, 1935, has been under the general supervision of Herbert E. Kahler, Superintendent of Fort Marion and Fort Matanzas National Monuments, St. Augustine, Florida.<sup>123</sup>

<sup>120</sup> *The Statutes at Large of the United States of America from December, 1923 to March, 1925*, Vol. XLIII, Part 2, Washington, 1925, p. 1968.

<sup>121</sup> Simons, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

<sup>122</sup> *National Military Park, National Park, Battlefield Site and National Monument Regulations, War Department* . . . Washington, 1931, p. 88.

<sup>123</sup> Arno B. Cammerer, Director of the National Park Service, to Herbert E. Kahler, December 15, 1935, in files of Fort Marion National Monument, St. Augustine, Florida.

The Castle Pinckney pierhead light was again rebuilt in 1933, and is now an unwatched, four second red flashing light on a white wooden skeleton tower, twenty-six feet above high water. This light at Castle Pinckney serves not only to mark the end of the wharf at that point but is also a guide for vessels using the Folly Island Channel when passing between Charleston and the Intra-coastal Waterway entrance just north of Sullivan's Island. Near Castle Pinckney for a number of years has been located the Castle Pinckney Lighted Buoy, a ten second red flashing gas light, placed in twenty-two feet of water in the Folly Island Channel.<sup>124</sup> Castle Pinckney is perhaps best known in Charleston Harbor today, not for the significance of its history, but for the service rendered by these lights.

The light in which Castle Pinckney and its significance is regarded today, even in Charleston, is perhaps best obtained from the observations of two recent local writers upon this subject. It was with regret that Katherine Drayton Simons, in 1930, found Castle Pinckney, along with the other great forts that once defended Charleston Harbor, in such a forlorn and forgotten condition, as only to be "counted among the minor lights and buoys which serve to guide the ships of every nation through her [Charleston's] Channel to her docks." However, she observed that Castle Pinckney was more fortunate than the other historic forts, since it had at least been made a national monument.<sup>125</sup> Thomas Petigrue Lesesne, author of the *History of Charleston County*, and well known local historian, more frankly comments in his *Landmarks of Charleston*, 1932, that

<sup>124</sup> U. S. Department of Commerce Lighthouse Service Light List . . . Atlantic and Gulf Coasts of the United States . . . Washington, 1932, p. 332; Cf., U. S. Department of Commerce Lighthouse Service Local Light and Buoy List . . . Cape Lookout to Dry Tortugas . . . Washington, 1936, p. 390; cf., W. P. Harman, Administrative Assistant, Commissioner of Lighthouses, Bureau of Lighthouses, Department of Commerce, Washington, to Rogers W. Young, Junior Historian, Fort Pulaski National Monument, December 9, 1936, in files of Fort Pulaski National Monument, Savannah, Georgia. See also the "United States Department of Commerce, Coast and Geodetic Survey Chart 470, United States . . . East Coast, South Carolina, Charleston Harbor and Approaches," which shows the location of the Castle Pinckney Lights. The pierhead light flashes every 4 seconds, for a period of 0.4 seconds, while the buoy flashes every 10 seconds for a period of 1 second.

<sup>125</sup> Simons, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

"Really there is more legend than history about Castle Pinckney, but long it has been a well-known landmark. . . . An excuse for including it among *Landmarks of Charleston* is that many strangers promenading on the High Battery wish to know what Castle Pinckney is."<sup>128</sup>

---

<sup>128</sup> Lesesne, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-38.

## GOVERNOR DRAYTON'S CONTRIBUTION TO GEOGRAPHY\*

BY RALPH H. BROWN†

*University of Minnesota*

The casual reader, perusing Governor John Drayton's *View of South Carolina as Respects her Natural and Civil Concerns* (Charleston, 1802), would perhaps not recognize it as an extraordinary literary fragment. When compared with other descriptive works of its kind it is found to contain the usual selection of material suitably indicated by its title, but the method of organization and the point of view from which it is written, at once logical and thoroughly modern, are likely to escape the reader's attention. Consequently the average reader of rare books would be inclined to agree with the brief comment in the *Dictionary of American Biography* (1930) that it is a valuable descriptive work, without being able to state clearly the qualities for which it is most distinguished. Should the reader be familiar with Thomas Jefferson's *Notes on the State of Virginia* (1784), he might be hesitant in accepting the suggestion that Drayton's *View* was inspired by the earlier work: certainly there is little resemblance between them. Moreover, although Drayton was punctilious in such matters, he fails to acknowledge indebtedness in this direction.

If one were choosing a contemporary geographical work which most nearly resembled the *View* in method and organization one could do no better than to select *Tableau du Climat et du Sol des Etats Unis d'Amérique* by the French geographer Constantin F. C. Volney. This book, published in Paris in 1803, was based largely upon study and travel in the United States from 1795 to 1798.

\* Prepared in connection with a survey of early American geographic literature made possible by grants-in-aid from the Social Science Research Council and the University of Minnesota for 1936-37.

† Ralph H. Brown: Born, Ayer, Massachusetts. Education B.S. University of Pennsylvania, 1921, University of Wisconsin, 1925. Instructor, University of Colorado 1925-1929, Assistant Professor of Geography, University of Minnesota, 1929 to present. Has contributed many articles to geographical journals, including the *Geographical Review*.

The resemblances are such that one cannot entirely disregard the possibility of an interchange of ideas at the time the two books were in preparation, especially because it is well known that Volney by letter or conversation discussed geographical problems with many eminent men. Since Volney's route did not take him to South Carolina, a discussion, if it took place, would have been carried on through letters. There being no evidence of such an interchange, and in the absence of any acknowledgement by Drayton, it seems fair to assume that the two books were authored by men who thought about similar things in a similar way.

Drayton himself appears not to have been aware that he had written a regional description of unusual quality. This becomes apparent from reading the preface he wrote on June 9, 1821, to the manuscript copy of his book deposited in the Charleston Library Society. According to the author: "The work was composed, written & printed during the years 1800, 1801 and 1802 by myself while I held the reins of Government of South Carolina." It was written not so much with the aim of "coming forward as an Author, as with the view of communicating for public use, the knowledge I had obtained from the enquiry of some years—laborious searches into books—and sources of information which were presented to me, during the performance of my Executive duties. I had no intention of producing a book on geography, or of entering into special statistical accounts, other than what it suited me to give—but I merely proposed to write about such things, as I believed myself justified in doing; not only from my own personal knowledge, but from good Authority: and that, in a mode and manner most convenient to myself."

The contemporary reviews which Drayton read and which he notes in his preface were not likely to lead an author of his modesty to regard his own work with undue gratification. Except in one instance<sup>1</sup> the reviews were favorable but none of them could be called enthusiastic. An author of a descriptive work during this period anticipated with justifiable concern any review which might

<sup>1</sup> *Monthly Anthology and Boston Review*, Vol. 3, 1806, pp. 205–210. Drayton seems justified in giving vent, in his manuscript preface, to his injured feelings upon reading this caustic and prejudiced review. The significant review mentioned below appeared in *The Medical Repository*, Vol. 3, Second Hexade, 1806, pp. 399–402.

come from the hand of Dr. Samuel L. Mitchill, a geologist and man of broad culture thoroughly familiar with the geographical literature of the time. Mitchill's review in *The Medical Repository*, of which he was editor, was distinctly not enthusiastic and, surprisingly enough, fails to comment on the features for which the *View* is most notable. This lack of appreciation has again been evidenced in the year just past in a volume<sup>2</sup> which treats of southern scientific achievements. Its author, apparently unacquainted with the great geographical works, gives the highest praise to



Pen and ink sketch of John Drayton, drawn by Eunice R. Brown from the colored engraving bound with his *Letters written during a tour through the northern and eastern states* (1794) preserved among the rare books in the New York Public Library.

Jefferson's *Notes on Virginia* (p. 12) and entirely overlooks Drayton's *View* even though he refers to some of his other literary works. Drayton himself does not mention the translation of his work into German, an honor rarely bestowed on works in American geography.<sup>3</sup>

The distinguishing feature of Drayton's book is most evident in the first few chapters wherein his discussion is based upon the

<sup>2</sup> Thomas Cary Johnson, Jr.: *Scientific Interests in the Old South*, D. Appleton-Century, N. Y. 1936.

<sup>3</sup> *Beschreibung von Sud-Carolina*, Bibliotek der Neuen Reisebeschreibung, Vol. 35, Weimar, 1808.

regions of the state. This regional method, so unlike the disorganized notes and compilations of Winterbotham, Morse, Ebeling and many others, is the accepted method in use in geographical works of today. Drayton's regional philosophy is best indicated by his own words. First having presented a generalized word picture of South Carolina he writes: "From this general view it appears that it [the state] may be properly divided into Lower, Middle and Upper Country. The soil, the natural growth and the political economy of its inhabitants add strength to this opinion. And, as considering it in these three large departments, confusion and omission may be avoided, the following pages will relate to all or each of them as occasion may require."

This is an admirable descriptive method, used here for the first time in discussions of any considerable area. Its use reveals a maturity of thought arrived at through preliminary inspection of the details which, variously combined, comprise the "face" of South Carolina. Drayton's three years of preparation were thus not spent in vain. The majority of descriptive writers of this period failed to progress, in their thinking, beyond the first stage, their treatises commonly appearing in the form of "notes" concerning a state or perhaps a larger area comprising various environments. To the reader of such material the localization of the writer's remarks within that area involves serious and sometimes insuperable problems. Drayton, with rare insight and having the needs of his readers in mind, understood that description by regions eliminated some confusion and possible omission; and, he might have added, avoided unnecessary repetition. An authority on regional geography<sup>4</sup> has recently stated the whole matter succinctly in these words: "Whether the regions have been loosely or sharply defined, whether the approach to delimitation has proceeded from the central core outwards or has concentrated on the outer boundaries themselves, regional subdivision . . . has been the organizing principle in the modern treatment of the geography of the lands."

Drayton's regions, which he uses so advantageously in the opening chapters of his *View*, are precisely defined. On his large folded map the boundaries of the regions are shown in color—a common-

<sup>4</sup> W. L. G. Joerg: *Transactions of the American Geophysical Union*, Sixteenth Annual Meeting, 1935, p. 239.

place procedure today but one entirely original with him. These boundaries are logically placed and ably defended. Drayton's map appears to have been the first one authored by an American on which regions are given definite and logical expression, just as the accompanying discussion in the opening chapters forms the earliest American contribution to the field of regional geography.

#### GAILLARD NOTES

Compiled by MABEL L. WEBBER

The French information given below is an addition and correction to the Gaillard Family Chart which was compiled about 1848, by Mr. Thomas Gaillard.

The first part of these notes were collected in Montpelier, France by Mr. Wm. D. Gaillard of New York City; and were compiled for him by M. Pierre Virenque, one of the librarians of the Municipal Library, who made an exhaustive search of the records for Gaillard births, marriages and deaths from 1562 to 1685. He collected nearly 100 items under the name of Gaillard. Mr. W. D. Gaillard deposited with the South Carolina Historical Society, copies of these data sent him by M. Virenque.

Space prevents our giving all of the French notes. The main So. Ca. line is followed from the chart made out for Mr. Wm. D. Gaillard.

---

"Jean Chaussetier, ep. Anne Gervais  
issue 1. Marguerate n. 15 Juillet 1578  
2. Anne n. 5 Juin 1579  
3. Jacques n. 16 Aout 1582  
4. Jane n. 19 Mai 1583  
5. Jean II n. 10 Juin 1587  
6. Gilette n. Fevrier 1591  
7. Gillette n. 7 Avril 1591  
8. Jean III n. 29 Nov. 1592, bourgeois & 13 Novembre 1663,  
ep. Marie Vincins.  
9. Isabeau n. 27 Dec. 1602

Issue of Jean and Marie Vincins

1. Joachim receveur des gabelles, n. 19 Juillet 1625, ep 24 Fevrier 1664, Esther Paparel de Lion

2. Jean n. 15 Octobre 1627
3. Marie n. 17 Dec. 1633, ep 30 Janv. 1676 Jean Bonneterre
4. Jean n. 30 Nov. 1639, ep 31 Janv. 1666 Isabeau Imbert
5. Marguirite ep. 20 Juin 1666 Claude Perdiguer"

Joachim Gaillard (Jean 2. Jean 1.) who was born 19 July 1625, and married 24 Feb. 1664 Esther Paparel had a son Simond born 1664, died July 1669.<sup>1</sup> That he also had sons Jean, Pierre, and Bartholomew, is abundantly proved by records in South Carolina, but nothing was found concerning them in the Archives of Montpelier or Lyons. As Joachim Gaillard was born 1625 and married 1664, he may have had an earlier wife, but there is no record of this.

The Ravenel List, about 1695, gives Joachim Gaillard son of Jean Gaillard of Montpelier in Languedoc; Ester Gaillard his wife, daughter Andre Paparel and Catherine Paperel of "Bouin en Foret". Jean and Pierre enfans of above.<sup>2</sup>

Baird, *Huguenot in America*, Vol. II p. 123 gives; M. Gaillard, "que monpere connoit, est arrive avec tout sa famille en Carolin". From this we may conclude that Joachim Gaillard or Peter who Married Elizabeth Le Clair, widow arrived in So. Ca. about 1687.

Peter, John and Bartholomew Gaillard, all were born prior to 1690 and then apparently of age. In 1687, Oct. 10, the Lords Proprietors issued orders for 600 acres to Joachim Gaillard in "James Town precinct," no grant for that tract is on record, but Jan. 18, 1688, three grants of 200 acres each adjoining were made to John Francois Gignillat, on Santee River, who on May 1690, conveyed to Joachim Gaillard and his sons Bartholomew and John, 200 acres each.<sup>3</sup> Joachim conveyed 200 acres South side Santee River for £140 to John Gaillard, gentleman Oct. 20, 1701, and 5 May 1690, Bartholomew Gaillard conveys 200 acres for £30 to John Gaillard. In 1692, May 22, Bartholomew makes his brother Jean Gaillard his attorney, probably because he was to be out of the Province. This establishes the fact that both Bartholomew and John were of age, and born out of the Province.

<sup>1</sup> French records in S. C. Historical Society.

<sup>2</sup> List of French and Swiss who desired naturalization, first printed about 1868.

<sup>3</sup> This *Magazine*, Vol. IX, p. 227.

On 16 Sept. 1701, John Gaillard sells to Peter Gaillard of the Province of South Carolina, Gentleman 2800 acres.<sup>4</sup>

7 Jan. 1706/7 Bartholomew Gaillard Mortgages to Eliz: Burtel, widow a plantation of 200 acres on North side of Santee River, "which said plantation, I the said Bartholomew Gaillard did purchase from my mother Ester Gaillard". Further proof that Esther (Paparel) Gaillard was the mother of Joachim Gaillard's children, as the "Ravenel List" gives Peter and John as the sons of Joachim and Esther. Bartholomew may have been out of the Province when the list was made (about 1695?). In his power of attorney, 1692 Bartholomew calls John his brother, and in the deed of 1706 calls Ester Gaillard his Mother.

The three adjoining tracts of 200 acres each, on the Santee River front taken by Jean Francoise de Gignilliat under his grant from the Lords Proprietors in 1688, who on 5 May 1690 conveyed land which included these three tracts, to Joachim, John and Bartholomew Gaillard, were included in French James Town.<sup>5</sup>

Most of the information concerning the Gaillard family of lower South Carolina was printed in the form of a family chart, gathered, and compiled by the late Mr. Thomas Gaillard prior to 1849; as he is careful to say, in the manuscript account of the family, there is much more material to be gathered from the Records, which would add to the family history, Mr. Gaillard was misled by the data he had access to, concerning the origin of the family. He makes Pierre Gaillard. (*Liste des Francois et Swiss etc.* page 25, No. 62) and his wife Elizabeth Le Clair, widow of Peter Melet, the ancestors of the existing family, while documentary evidence shows beyond dispute that Joachim Gaillard (*Ibid* p. 26, No. 74) was the actual ancestor.

This Peter, or Pierre Gaillard was probably the one who with a wife Madelaine, was imported by Isaac Caillabeuf, in 1692; he was a blockmaker, and seems afterwards to have married Elizabeth Le Clair widow, and to have had a daughter Cleremond born in South Carolina before 1695; this Pierre died about 1705 or 1706, leaving a will now missing; no descendants of his appear on such records as are now accessible.

Joachim Gaillard, the ancestor of the South Carolina family, is

<sup>4</sup> M. C. O.

<sup>5</sup> This *Magazine*, Vol. IX, p. 222.

entered in the above mentioned "Liste des French et Swisses", which is taken from an old manuscript list of the French and Swiss protestants, settled near Charles Town on the Santee River and in the Orange Quarter, who desired naturalization, and was prepared about 1695/6, first printed about 1868, and since several times reprinted.

Joachim Gaillard was in S. C. by Oct. 10, 1687, for on that date the Lords Proprietors issued an order for 600 acres to be measured out to him in James Town precinct.<sup>6</sup> *French James-Town*, by Judge Henry A. M. Smith.)

On 29 June 1705/6, Jean Guibal, Rene Ravelen, Bartholomew Gaillard, *Junr.* (probably to distinguish him from Pierre Gaillard mentioned above) were commissioned to sell the lots of the newly laid out town at James Town; Bartholomew purchased lots No. 1 and 36; John Gaillard No. 2, and Pierre Gaillard No. 10.<sup>7</sup>

May 22, 1692, Bartholomew Gaillard, being about to leave the Province, makes his brother Jean Gaillard his attorney.

Peter Gaillard, who received several warrants for land between 1704 and 1710, leaves a will, now missing, dated . . . 1710; from various deeds we find that he left £ 5 currency to the French Church at James Town.<sup>8</sup> That his brother Jean Gaillard was an executor, and that he left a legacy to Helene, daughter of his brother Bartholomew. (Receipt in French, dated Oct. 1710, from Bartholomew Gaillard to "Du Sieur Jean Gaillard mon frere" Administrator etc. for Pierre Gaillard for Helene Gaillard ma fille."<sup>9</sup>

John Gaillard, brother of Pierre and Bartholomew, received a number of warrants for land between 1696 and 1710, he also left a will now missing but partially recited in deeds. He married first, after 1699, Susannah Le Sururier, widow of Jean Francois de Gignilliat; he next married Marie Ester Page, who survived him and married James Kinloch; the only issue of John Gaillard yet found was his daughter Susannah, by his first wife, who married James Nicholson Mayrant.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 258.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> *Transactions of the Huguenot Society of S. C.*, 1907, No. 14, p. 24.

<sup>9</sup> Registrars Records, Office of the Historical Commission of S. C., Vol. 1709-1719, p. 93.

<sup>10</sup> This *Magazine*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 82.

Capt. Bartholomew Gaillard Esq. of St. James Santee, Craven County, between Aug. 5, 1709 and Feb. 16, 1709/10, received four warrants for land, numbering 2500 acres.<sup>11</sup>

In the grant for the laying out of James Town he is mentioned as Captain Bartholomew Gaillard, and also Act of Assembly 23 June 1717, and *Statutes at Large of S. C.*, Vol. 9, p. 29).

He left a will, dated 15 July, 1718. which like so many of our early wills, is missing. From several deeds we find he left a widow Elizabeth, who married second, March 26, 1718/19, Jonathan Skrine.<sup>12</sup>

Proof that the following children were the sons and daughters of Bartholomew Gaillard, is to be found in several deeds, particularly the following:<sup>13</sup> Tacitus Gaillard, of St. James Santee, planter, Alcimus Gaillard of Charleston, merchant, Theodore Gaillard of St. James Santee, planter, all sons of Bartholomew Gaillard, Esq., deceased, who by his will 15th July 1718, devised all his lands except his plantation at Santee to his sons, Theodore, Alcimus, and Tacitus and his daughter Eleanor; the said Eleanor made over her share to her brother Frederick Gaillard late of this Province, deceased, and to Theodore Gaillard, one of the parties hereto . . . said Frederick since deceased, without issue, his share descended to the above mentioned Theodore Gaillard, as his eldest brother.<sup>14</sup> Release of inheritance: whereas Bartholomew Gaillard deceased, devised to his wife Elizabeth, the ferry now known as Skrines Ferry, with revision to Frederick Gaillars, his eldest son [Frederick conveys the revision to Jonathan Skrine who had married the widow of Bartholomew in March, 1719]

Issue of Bartholomew Gaillard the Ancestor of the South Carolina family.

1. Frederick Gaillard born 1715 or earlier, died without issue 1741: he was married by Aug. 6, 1736 to Elizabeth, daughter of Peter Guerry and Margaret Rembert, said Margaret was the daughter of André Rembert<sup>15</sup> May 3, 1737 Frederick Gaillard of Craven

<sup>11</sup> *Warrants for Lands in S. C.*

<sup>12</sup> This *Magazine*, Vol. XII, p. 186, Register of St. Andrews parish.

<sup>13</sup> Probate Court, Charleston, S. C. Book, 1736-1740, p. 251.

<sup>14</sup> Mesne Conveyance Office, Book A A, p. 147.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid Book R, p. 20.

Co. planter and Elizabeth his wife convey the property devised to said Elizabeth by her grandfather Andrew Rembert.<sup>16</sup>

Frederick Gaillard died before 1741, and his widow Elizabeth married 2d Henry Varner, Jan. 21, 1744/45 (this Magazine Vol. XX p. 69.)

2. Theodore Gaillard born in So. Ca. before 1714, died between March and July 1781, he was a planter in St. James Santee. He married first a daughter of Noe Serre and second after 1734 Lydia Peyre.<sup>17</sup>

As Theodore Gaillard of St. James Santee, planter, his will dated 16 March 1781, and proved 7 July 1781, leaves property to his wife Lydia for life and then to the sons of his son Charles. To son John the Wambaw plantation, 1450 acres. Leaves £ 1500 for the education of his grandsons, sons of his son Charles. Mentions "all my children". To son Peter 50 negroes, to be taken from among the negroes his son David, deceased had at St. Stephens, Lands at St. Stephens named in will to son Peter. Rest of estate to sons John and Theodore, and daughter Catherine.

Executors, wife Lydia, sons John, Theodore and Peter, and Elias Ball.<sup>18</sup>

His wife Lydia, of St. James Santee, died intestate, and Mr. Charles Gaillard of the same place, planter administered 21 April 1786.<sup>19</sup>

His descendants are given in Mr. Thomas Gaillard's chart.

3. Helen Gaillard, conveyed part of her inheritance under her father Bartholomews will before 1741; no further record.
4. Alcimus Gaillard, third son of Bartholomew Gaillard, born before 1716, was a merchant, married (1) a daughter of James Belin (see Belin will 1744/5) he married 2d July 1744, Sarah, daughter of John Gendron and Elizabeth Mazyck. By his first wife he had sons Bartholomew and James by his second wife, a son John.
5. Tacitus Gaillard, fourth son of Bartholomew Gaillard, lived first in the parish of St. James Santee. He purchased from his

<sup>16</sup> Ibid Book S, p. 408.

<sup>17</sup> Gaillard Chart.

<sup>18</sup> Probate Court, Charleston, S. C.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

brother Frederick in August, 1736, three plantations in Craven County on the Santee River in all 1100 acres. He married prior to June 1746, Ann LeGrand, daughter of Isaac LeGrand d'Anerville and his wife Ann Francois Lomboy. Ann Francois Lomboy was the eldest daughter of Henry Bruneau and his wife Marianne and the adopted daughter of Jacques Le Grand de Lomboy and Ann Francois his wife: articles of adoption dated 20th Feb. 1713/14, recorded in Probate Court, Charleston, S. C. Book 1722/26, page 116, and also in the will of Jaques Le Grand.

A deed (M.C.O. Charleston, Book H.H., p. 165,) recites the heirs of Isaac LeGrand under his will dated 23 Feb. 1739/40 old style; the heirs being his wife Ann Francois LeGrand, his son Isaac and his daughters Ann and Margaret. Partition was made 2d June, 1746, the wife Ann Francois being then dead. Margaret died intestate and without issue, her brother Isaac inherited her share of the land, Ann had married Tacitus Gaillard.

Tacitus Gaillard was a Justice of the Peace for Craven County in 1756 (This Magazine Vol. 20, p. 74) a Member of Assembly for St. James Santee in 1765 (S. C. Almanac) and a member in 1775 and 1776 for Orangeburg district (Journal of the Gen. Assembly March and April 1776, p. 18)

He had a plantation near Eutaw Springs, was a Col. of Militia in 1769; was representative for St. Mathews parish in 1765, but upon the repeal of the act to establish that parish, he and Col. Thompson quitted their Seats, Nov. 10, 1767 (Salley, History of Orangeburg County, p. 251. He was a representative of St. Mathews parish in Dec. 1772; his seat was contested by Isaac Huger but Mr. Gaillard served out his term which lasted to September 15, 1775, the last Assembly under the Royal Government.

Col. Tacitus Gaillard represented St. Mathews parish at the Convention of the people held in CharlesTown, July 6, 1774, and was a delegate to the Provincial Congress, Nov. 1775. He was returned to the Commons House of Assembly in October 1768 for both St. James Goose Creek and St. George, Dorchester, he sat for the latter (McCrady, 1719-1776, p. 609)

He had large land holdings in Ninety-Six District and conveys

with his son Isaac, also a planter, 390 acres in that District May 13, 1774.

John Savage, his son-in-law, of Ninety-six district, store-keeper, conveys to him 400 acres in Ninety-six purchased by John Savage Jan. 38, 1768.

Benj. Farrar, another son-in-law of Tacitus Gaillard, conveyed to him on 15 Nov. 1774, 200 acres on Ninety-six creek.

Just what date Tacitus removed to Louisiana or Mississippi has not been found; probably in 1778 or 1779; and possibly because like other members of his family his sympathies were with the Tories.

The birth dates of the children of Tacitus Gaillard and his wife Anne LeGrand are missing with the exception of two,

1. Tacitus, baptised at Santee, Feb. 11, 1749/50, Christ Church Register, no further record.
2. Margaret, born March 22, 1758, Register St. James, Santee, she married Abraham Ellis, and her descendants are living in Miss. and Louisiana.
3. Elizabeth, dates unknown, married Benj. Farran of Orangeburg Dist. he was living in St. Mathews parish in 1768.
4. Isaac, died unmarried? about 1806 in Miss.
5. Theodore died unm.? on False River.
6. Ann, born 1744, married in February 1769, John Savage Esq. of Ninety-six District (*S. C. Gatz. & County Journal* Feb. 14, 1769) she died in Miss. in 1793.

John Savage is given in the Family Record as "Col. Savage an English Officer." Mr. Worthington Fords, *List of British Officers Serving in America*, (N. E. Historic and Geneal. Register Vol. 49, 1894) gives John Savage as an Ensign in the 17th Regiment, Feb. 2d. 1757. If this is the same John Savage, he had settled in the Ninety-six district before 1769, had purchased land there. He was a Col. in the Ninety-six Militia. He died September 1776 (This Magazine Vol. X, p. 224) no will has been found. His widow Ann and her two daughters Mary and Ann, left the state with their grandfather Tacitus Gaillard. She owned a plantation near Natches, Miss. Her will dated 12 Sept. 1793 mentions only her daughter Mary Savage, who was then 23 years old (data from Mrs. Anna F. Martin, a descendant of Mary Savage).

This Mary Savage married in Cambridge S.C. 17 April 1792, her second husband William Conner, had issue by him. The descendants now live in Miss. and Louisiana.

For later generations see the chart of the Gaillard family by Mr. Thomas Gaillard, published in 1849.

## DuPRÉ RECORDS

Contributed by A. S. SALLEY

The following records were copied from a Bible formerly owned by Thomas J. J. DuPré and now in possession of Mrs. John F. Townsend (Mary Mittie DuPré), daughter of William Alexander and Elizabeth (Webster) DuPré, of Bennettsville. The contributor was enabled to procure these records through the courtesy of Miss Katherine Townsend, of Columbia, granddaughter of Mrs. John F. Townsend.

Thomas J. J. DuPré and Margaret Thomson was married June 16<sup>th</sup>, 1813 Joseph A. Bruce and Elizabeth S. DuPré was married January 17<sup>th</sup>, 1839.

Robert C. Emanuel and Sarah J. DuPré was married November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1842.

John M. Corgill and Margaret T. DuPré was married July 5<sup>th</sup>, 1843.

---

James DuPré was born September 24<sup>th</sup>, 1814 about Three O Clock in the morning—

Elizabeth Swinton DuPré was born February 26<sup>th</sup>, 1816 about Nine O Clock in the morning—

William Alexander DuPré was born August 30<sup>th</sup>, 1817 about Nine O Clock in the Evening—

Thomas Johnson DuPré was born March 4<sup>th</sup>, 1819 about Ten O Clock in the Morning—

Sarah Johnson DuPré was born June 8<sup>th</sup>, 1820 about Four O Clock in the Afternoon—

Hugh Thomson DuPré was born March 11<sup>th</sup>, 1822 about Ten Oclock in the Morning

Samuel DuPré was born March 11<sup>th</sup>, 1822 about Eleven Oclock in the Morning

Sarah Johnson DuPré was born October 26<sup>th</sup>, 1823 about five O Clock in the Morning

Margaret Thomson DuPré was born February 5<sup>th</sup>, 1827 about half after Eleven Oclock at Night—

Died on the 23<sup>rd</sup>, of October 1820—Sarah Johnson DuPré Aged four Month and Fifteen Days—

Died on the 19<sup>th</sup>, of March 1822 Samuel DuPré Aged eight Days—

Died on the 25<sup>th</sup>, of May 1822 Hugh Thomson DuPré Aged two Months and fourteen Days—

Died on the 6<sup>th</sup>, of February 1827 about four Oclock in the morning Margaret DuPré Wife of Tho<sup>s</sup>, J. J. DuPré Aged Thirty Six Years and about Three Months—

Departed this life June 11<sup>th</sup>, 1844 about 2 Oclock in the afternoon Margaret T. Corgill Wife of John M. Corgill and Daughter of Tho<sup>s</sup>. J. J. and Margaret DuPré aged 17 years 4 Months and 6 days—

Departed this life April 4<sup>th</sup> 1846 Mrs., Elizabeth Witherspoon aged ninety years.

Thomas J. J. DuPré, departed this life, Septr 7<sup>th</sup> 1863, Aged 77 yr, 8 mo & 26 days

William Alexander DuPré departed this life Sept. 23<sup>rd</sup>.. 1888 Age 71 years. 24 days.

#### A LOYALIST REVOLUTIONARY CLAIM

The memorial slab, in St. Andrews Church, Hove, England, to Robert Cooper, only son of Rev. Robert Cooper, rector of St. Michael's, Wood Street, London and formerly rector of St. Philip's Church, Charlestown, South Carolina, placed there subsequent to 1835 and discovered in 1936, by Mr. George C. Birlant, commented on in the October number of this MAGAZINE,<sup>1</sup> has brought a "side light upon the "posessions" relinquished by one of the Loyalists. In examining the London Claims of S. C. Loyalists the Rev. H. D. Bull, Rector of Prince Frederick's Church, Georgetown, S. C., established 1734, noted the following:

"Rev. Robert Cooper. Was approached and urged to sign the oath of Association: he signed with a 'reserve' appended. About three months afterwards a committee of three gentlemen waited on him and told him that if he did not erase the 'reserve' (condition) which he had appended to his signature that the consequences would be very disagreeable. He gave his assent, but

---

<sup>1</sup> *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Mag.* Vol. XXXVIII, Oct. 1937, p. 120.

continued loyal. He continued to offer public prayers for the King; he offered them on the day (28 June 1776) Sir Peter Parker made his attack on Sullivan's Island. The following Sunday 'He was dismissed from (*sic*) the Vestry. In April 1777 he was called upon to take the oath of allegiance to the State and abjuration to the King. He refused to take it and in consequence was obliged to quit the place in 60 days and went to Holland' and from there to England. 'In 1781 he returned to Charlestown and was on his arrival appointed to the Church of St. Philip by the Vestry of the Parish and continued there until the evacuation when he came to England. Has nothing but 60 pounds a year.'<sup>2</sup>

From the records of the Probate Court and Register of Mesne Conveyances of Charleston, S. C., it seems established that between the dates, 1781 & 1785 he received payment in South Carolina to the extent of about \$20,000. and later his son collected additionally \$3,750.<sup>3</sup>

### THE THOMAS ELFE ACCOUNT BOOK 1765-1775

Contributed by MABEL L. WEBBER

Copied by ELIZABETH H. JERVEY

(Continued from January)

#### JANUARY 1774

.172 Bonds and Notes D. <sup>r</sup> To Sundries	£ 338.13.
.143 To Handicraft Slaves for W. <sup>m</sup> Pat-	
tersons Note	92.18.9
for his Order on Moncreife	56.
for K. <sup>y</sup> Salter & J. <sup>c</sup> Stevenson's	
Note	126.
13 for James Browns Note	36.14.3      311.13
	<hr/>
.16 James Brown for his Note	27.
.142 Shop      D <sup>r</sup> To Bonds and Notes	£ 19.4
.172      To Abram Maddox for part of	
his Bond	
Sundries      D <sup>r</sup> To Shop	£ <u>696.1</u>
so much sold this Month viz	

<sup>2</sup> The Royal Com. on Losses and Services of American Loyalists 1782-1785, Roxburgh Club, 1915. H. E. Egerton, ed., p. 111.

<sup>3</sup> *South Carolina Hist. and Genalogical Mag.* Vol. XXXVIII, Oct. 1937, pp. 123-125.

.174 Atkins & Neston 25 <sup>th</sup>	a full trimm'd Cedar Coffin for Ch <sup>s</sup> Sawkins	45.
.161 Broughton And. <sup>r</sup> 24 <sup>th</sup>	a full trimm'd ditto for M <sup>r</sup> Singleton	45.
.165 Drayton W <sup>m</sup> Hen. <sup>y</sup> 11 <sup>th</sup>	mend. <sup>s</sup> round tea table & din. <sup>s</sup> d. <sup>o</sup>	2.
	smoothing the rim of a China tea table	.10
		2.10
.136 Downs & Lee 14 <sup>th</sup>	making a work bench w <sup>th</sup> 2 Cases Drawers	28.10
	alterting a Desk	2.
	15 <sup>th</sup> 6 Mahogany Waiters a 6/	1.16
		32.6
.174 Devize Cornelius 15 <sup>th</sup>	a Mahogany Desk	50.
.34 Estate of Sam. <sup>l</sup> Cardy 24 <sup>th</sup>	a full trimm'd cover'd Coffin	85.
.73 Giles John 21 <sup>st</sup>	mending a Mahogany Chair	.10
.31 Hutchinson Tho. <sup>s</sup> 11 <sup>th</sup>	a Mahogany dining Table	18.
.175 Kershaw & C. <sup>o</sup> 25 <sup>th</sup>	a 3 & $\frac{1}{2}$ foot Mahogany dining Table	16.
.71 Leger & Greenwood 7 <sup>th</sup>	2 Mahog. <sup>y</sup> tables 3 ft by 9	38.
	One dozen Mahog. <sup>y</sup> Chairs brass Nailed	120.
		158.
.93 Lockwood Josh. <sup>s</sup> 20 <sup>th</sup>	putt. <sup>s</sup> a new Top to a knife Case of Mahog. <sup>y</sup>	4.
.69 Lowndes Rawlins 21 <sup>st</sup>	3 Window Laths with Pullies a 30/	4.10
.164 Pinckney Cha. <sup>s</sup>	Coates w <sup>th</sup> 1 <sup>st</sup> 3 Window Blinds of Mahogany	10.10
	Canvas with brass hooks a 70/ ea	
.171 Stevenson Peter 15 <sup>th</sup>	2 poplar Bedsteads colour'd	13.
.44 Valton Peter 25 <sup>th</sup>	putting up 3 pictures & taking of some Locks	.10

.87	Waring John 1 <sup>st</sup> two pieces Maho-			
	any plank			1. 5
.112	Williamson W. <sup>m</sup> to a full trimm'd black cov. <sup>d</sup> Cedar Coffin for B.			
	Williamson			90.
	Carried up			£ 576.1
	Sundries D. <sup>r</sup> To Shop			
	Brought up			£ 576. 1
.164	Waring Sarah Widow of Benj. <sup>n</sup> War-			
	ing			
	15 <sup>th</sup> a double Chest Drawers w <sup>th</sup>			
	ped. <sup>t</sup> head	85.		
	a Sett large 3 wheel Castors	2.10		87.10
				_____
.174	Waring Morton 26 <sup>th</sup> a pair Maho. <sup>y</sup>			
	dining Tables 3½ feet			32.
.83	Young Francis 20 <sup>th</sup> taking down &			
	packing up 2 Bedsteads			.10
.142				
.142	Shop D. <sup>r</sup> To Tho. <sup>s</sup> Shrimp-			
	ton			£ 592. 4.7
.150	for sundry locks & Brasses as p In-			
	voice p Capt. Sam. <sup>l</sup> Ball			
	Amount. <sup>s</sup> to £84.12.1 Stg.			
.173	Cash D. <sup>r</sup> To Sundries			£ 246.
	so much received			
.142	To Shop the 5 <sup>th</sup>	36.5		
	for turning of Mungo Fin-			
	layson	20.2.6		
	for ditto of Fortell	10.7.6		
	15 <sup>th</sup> for ditto of Paul Smizer	8.15		
	18 <sup>th</sup> for ditto of Charles			
	Pinckney	24.12.6		
	25 <sup>th</sup> for Sunday	21.		121. 2.6
				_____
.123	To Tho. <sup>s</sup> Hayward the 7 <sup>th</sup> in full			59.17.6
.151	To Estate Jos. <sup>h</sup> Fabian 13 <sup>th</sup> in full			40.

.39	To James Lynah Doctor 18 <sup>th</sup>	25.
	Sundries D. <sup>r</sup> To Cash	£ 413.2 .6
	so much paid this Month	
.142	Shop the 1 <sup>st</sup>	£ 49.5
	5 <sup>th</sup> to Jenkins	5.
	18 <sup>th</sup> to James Fullerton	132.3 .9
	to Andrew Lord in full	1.17.6
		188. 6.3
		_____
.172	Bonds and Notes lent D. <sup>r</sup> Mottett on his Note of hand	112.
.113	House Expences for a peice of Lin- nen to Jn. <sup>o</sup> Gordon	£ 17.16.3
	to Oats & Russel	61. 2.6
	to Henry Swinton	3.17.6
	to Simonson & Brower	10.
	to Corn & C	20.
		112.16.3
		_____

## FEBRUARY 1774

Sundries	D. <sup>r</sup> To Shop	£ 746.10
	for so much sold this Month viz	
.161	Ancrum Geo. & C. <sup>o</sup> 25 <sup>th</sup> a Cedar Cof- fin w <sup>th</sup> plates & hand. <sup>s</sup>	
	for Ann Beard	35.
.136	Downs and Lee 7 <sup>th</sup> mend. <sup>s</sup> Clock	
	Case & clean. <sup>s</sup> it up	£ 3.10
	21 mend. <sup>s</sup> ditto	4.
		7.10
.175	Duetart Jn. <sup>o</sup> The 9 <sup>th</sup> 1 doz. <sup>n</sup> Splat back Chairs	£160.
	1 tea-table	13.
	1 dining table	13.
	1 ditto 4 feet	22.
	1 Slabb Table	26.
	1 Night ditto	26.
	1 large Teaboard	2.10
	18 <sup>th</sup> 1 doz. <sup>n</sup> Mahog. <sup>y</sup> Chairs hair Bottoms	85.
	24 2 Chamber Tables	18.
	a China frett tea Table	20.
		385.10
		_____

.102	Drayton Jn. <sup>o</sup> the 25 <sup>th</sup> putt. <sup>g</sup> up Tap-			
	estry and mend. <sup>g</sup>			
	2 Mahog. <sup>y</sup> Chairs		1.10	
.62	Fisher Jn. <sup>o</sup> the 9 <sup>th</sup> turning 2 Setts			
	bed Posts		2.10	
.73	Giles Jn. <sup>o</sup> the 14 <sup>th</sup> 2 Tea boards		3.	
.29	Gaillard Jn. <sup>o</sup> the 15 <sup>th</sup> a commode fret			
	China Table	£ 45.		
	a Set of Castors	1.	46.	
				—
.72	Garden D. <sup>r</sup> the 18 <sup>th</sup> a Cypress Box		1.10	
.55	Lambton Rich. 5 <sup>th</sup> open. <sup>g</sup> a Beaufet			
	lock & putting on a new one		1.10	
.91	Leger Peter 10 <sup>th</sup> a Mahogany com-			
	mode dress. <sup>g</sup> drawers	£ 65.		
	14 <sup>th</sup> putt. <sup>g</sup> on Sett of Castors &			
	mend. <sup>g</sup> Bedstead	.10	65.10	
				—
.71	Leger & Greenwood 17 <sup>th</sup> mend. <sup>g</sup> a			
	double Chest Drawers		4.	
.168	Milligan D. <sup>r</sup> 9 <sup>th</sup> mend. <sup>g</sup> a square tea			
	table & dining ditto		1.	
.107	Oliphant D. <sup>r</sup> 9 <sup>th</sup> mend. <sup>g</sup> an Elbow			
	Chair	£ .15		
	mend. <sup>g</sup> a stand with a new			
	Cut fret &c	1.5	2.	
				—
.162	Peterman Lew. <sup>s</sup> 1 <sup>st</sup> 6 Mahog. <sup>y</sup> Chairs			
	hair Bottoms		45.	
.79	Peronneau Alex. <sup>r</sup> 17 <sup>th</sup> silver. <sup>g</sup> a			
	dress. <sup>g</sup> Glass & gild. <sup>g</sup> frame		4.	
.175	Prelove Jn. <sup>o</sup> 23 a Mahogany dining			
	Table	£ 16.		
	a poplar Bedstead	6.10		
	25 a dining Table	16.		
	a breakfast ditto	16.		
	a poplar bedstead	6.10	61.	
				—
.168	Russel Walter the 1 <sup>st</sup> 2 tea boards	£ 2.10		
	7 <sup>th</sup> a Chamber table	8.	10.10	
	Carried up			
	Sundries     D. <sup>r</sup> To Shop		£ 677.	
	brought up			
			£ 677.	

.74	Scottowe Tho. <sup>s</sup> 14 <sup>th</sup> a large Cypress press	£ 45.
.17	Smith Henry 25 <sup>th</sup> a Mahogany frame for a picture	7.
.44	Valton Peter 5 <sup>th</sup> mending a Spin- net &c	.5
.87	Waring Jn. <sup>o</sup> 7 <sup>th</sup> mend. <sup>g</sup> a Mahog. <sup>h</sup> Desk & brass Slip for lock mend. <sup>g</sup> the top of a Stand	£ 1. .5 _____ 1. 5
.84	Wigfall Ben. <sup>n</sup> 23 <sup>d</sup> mend. <sup>g</sup> a side board Table	£ 1.10
	colour. <sup>g</sup> a poplar bedstead	1.
	mend. <sup>g</sup> a din. <sup>g</sup> table with a new Leg	2. _____ 4.10
.176	Waters Jn. <sup>o</sup> 25 <sup>th</sup> a Mahog. <sup>y</sup> Cornice for Bedstead	£ 7. _____
.142	a Sett of Laths and pullies for ditto	4.10 _____ 11.10
	Sundries D. <sup>r</sup> To Atkins & Weston	£ 45.
.142	Shop 23 <sup>d</sup> for Sundry's as p Acc. <sup>t</sup>	31.10
.113	House Expences ditto	13.10 _____
.174		
.173	Cash D. <sup>r</sup> To Sundries for so much received this Month	£1171.14.9
.142	To Shop the 1 <sup>st</sup> for Mahogany for a half drawers	£ 7.10 35.
	2 for a Stand and Cradle	16.17.6
	11 for turn. <sup>g</sup> of Will. <sup>m</sup> Axton	25.1
	15 for a bed chair	10.
	24 for Stuff &c a Desk £47 a table £9	69. _____ 163. 8.6

.172 To Bonds & Notes the 1 <sup>st</sup> in part		
Timrods Bond	£350.	
15 <sup>th</sup> in part of Jacob Valks		
Note	227.	
in full for W. Waynes Note	36.13.9	
in part Dan. <sup>1</sup> Harper's Bond	180.	793.13.9
.142 To Shop the 11 <sup>th</sup> of M <sup>rs</sup> Hext in full		26.
.92 To Interest Acc. <sup>t</sup> the 9 <sup>th</sup> for Int. <sup>st</sup> on Timrod's bond	£ 20.	
15 <sup>th</sup>	24.	44.
.169 To Francisco Morelli 5 <sup>th</sup> on account		20.
.158 To Henry Lybert 8 <sup>th</sup> in full		35.
Carried over		£1082. 2.3
Cash D. <sup>r</sup> To Sundries Brought over		£1082. 2.3
.165 To John Creighton		61.12.6
.135 To Rob. <sup>t</sup> Swanston the 11 <sup>th</sup> on acc. <sup>t</sup>		28.
Sundries D. <sup>r</sup> To Cash		£1610. 7.8
for so much paid this Month		
.142 Shop the 11 <sup>th</sup> for work to John Ralph	£ 70.	
14 To Pott Shaw	31.16	
14 To Rich. <sup>d</sup> Cole for a Mahogany Board	8.17.6	
18 <sup>th</sup> To Jn. <sup>o</sup> Love in full	40.	150.13.6
.113 House Expences the 5 <sup>th</sup> To King Chitty Sadler	£ 5.15	
Edm. <sup>d</sup> Egan for a Barr. <sup>1</sup>		
Beer	11.17.6	
7 Ja. <sup>s</sup> Thomson for School. <sup>2</sup>		
Tommy	20.15.	
" Jn. <sup>o</sup> Scott for 12 <sup>m</sup> Rent	150.	
8 Henry Lybert for Beef	44.14.6	

10 for Corn &c	20.
14 To Maskall & Pratt Smiths	6.12.6
" To Jn. <sup>o</sup> Vinyard Breeches maker	11.
16 To Fra. <sup>o</sup> Shepperd Tay- lor	8.
" To Atkins and Weston	4. 8.3
28 To Sundries	40. 2.6      323. 5.3
<hr/>	
.64 Jacob Valk the 5 <sup>th</sup> for his Note of hand	700.
.61 House in Queen Street 11 <sup>th</sup> To Benj. <sup>n</sup> Barker in full	436. 8.11

(To be Continued)

MARRIAGE AND DEATH NOTICES FROM THE CITY  
GAZETTE OF CHARLESTON, S. C.

Compiled by ELIZABETH HEYWARD JERVEY

(Continued from January)

Died, on Wednesday, the 5th inst. at St. Stephen's Santee, Mrs. Jane Cooper. (Thursday January 13, 1814.)

Died, at St. Thomas' Parish, on Saturday, the 19th of December, in the seventeenth year of his age, Master William Lee Joel, of this city. . . . But a few days previous to his death he was the hope of an aged Father, the fondest boast of an Affectionate Sister. . . . (Friday January 14, 1814.)

Died, on the 4th inst. Mr. George W. Annely of this city, aged 39 years. (Tuesday January 18, 1814.)

Married on Saturday evening, in St. Thomas's by the Rev. Mr. Warren Doctor William S. Jenkins, to Miss Jane Keith Ogier, both of this city. (Wednesday January 19, 1814.)

Departed this life, on the 16th inst. Mr. John Hanahan, in the 36th year of his age. (Thursday January 20, 1814.)

Departed this life on the 14th instant, Mrs. Jesse Henderson, aged thirty-eight years; a native of Scotland, late consort of Mr. Daniel Henderson, of this city—she has left a disconsolate husband and five small children to deplore her loss. (Monday January 24, 1814.)

Departed this life on the 7th inst. after a lingering illness, Mrs. Rebecca Smith, in the 63d year of her age. As a parent she was particularly affectionate. . . . (Wednesday January 26, 1814.)

Married in this city, on Tuesday the 25th instant, by the Rev. Dr. Gallagher, Mr. Dennis M'Namara, of Laurens District, to the amiable Miss Margaret Kennedy, daughter of Mr. George Kennedy, of Chester Court House, S. C.

Married, last evening, by the Rev. Mr. Simons, Mr. Christopher Nelson to Miss Johanna Hillgendorf, both of this city. (Tuesday January 27, 1814.)

Capt. Hatch:—A subscription is opened at this Office for the relief of the family of this gallant man, who died on Saturday last,

of the wounds he received in the late attack on the U.S. schr. *Alligator*. [British ship and two Brigs drove the Alligator on shore at Stono.] (Monday February 7, 1814.)

The Friends and Acquaintances of Mr. Elijah Elias Prioleau, are requested to attend his Funeral This Afternoon at 3 o'clock, from the residence of his Mother, Corner of Maiden Lane and Ellery street. (Tuesday February 8, 1814.)

Died, on the 1st instant in Barnwell district, Mrs. Ellen Bellinger consort of Dr. John Skottowe Bellinger. . . . (Thursday February 10, 1814.)

Died, on Sunday last, Mr. David Chalmers, of this city, aged 29 years. (Wednesday February 16, 1814.)

The Friends, Acquaintances and the Officers and Members of the South Carolina Society, are requested to attend the Funeral of Mr. Thomas Bennett, Sen. from his late residence in Montague-street, at 4 o'clock This Afternoon. (Friday, February 18, 1814.)

Married, on Thursday evening last, by the Right Rev. Bishop Dehon Mr. Luke Bours, of the firm of Bours & Bascome, merchants, to Mrs. Jane Boswell Forster, daughter of the late James Bentham, esq.; all of this city.

Departed this life on the 22d ult. Mrs. Frances Palmer, in the 39th year of her age, universally regretted by her relatives and friends.

Departed this life on the 11th inst. in Orangeburg, (S.C.) after a severe illness, Mr. Gideon Jennings, aged 61 years. He has left a widow and six children, with a numerous circle of friends, to lament their irreparable loss. (Saturday, February 19, 1814.)

Married on Sunday evening last, by the Rev. Dr. Hollinshead, Daniel Cain, Esq. of St. Stephen's Parish, to Miss Eliza M. Malcomson daughter of the late Rev. James Malcomson, of this city. (Friday February 25, 1814.)

Married, on Sunday evening, the 27th ult. by the Rev. Mr. Simmons Captain Walter Smith, to Mrs. Hester Keenan, both of this city.

In the 18th year of her age, and first of her marriage, died, Mrs. Frances Cecilia Colclough, after a severe illness. . . . (Wednesday, March 2, 1814.)

The Friends and Acquaintances of Mr. & Mrs. A. E. Beggs, are

requested to attend her Funeral This Morning, at 10 o'clock, from her late residence, No. 167, King-street.

The Friends and Acquaintances of the late William Rivers, are requested to attend his Funeral This Afternoon, at 4 o'clock, from his Brother's residence, No. 6, Water-street. (Saturday, March 5, 1814.)

Departed this life, on the 1st ult. after a short illness, at her father's seat near Statesburgh, Miss Mary M. Vaughan, aged sixteen years, daughter of Henry Vaughan, Esq. . . . She was a dutiful and affectionate daughter, and a kind and loving sister—her bereaved parents, and other relatives, deeply deplore their loss; . . . (Tuesday, March 8, 1814.)

Died, some time since, on his passage from N. Orleans to Mobile Lieut. Benj. Robert Harvey, of the Third Regiment of United States Infantry, in the 25th year of his age, son of Capt. Benj. Harvey of this city.

The Friends and Acquaintances of Mrs. Mary Eason, are invited to attend her Funeral from the residence of John Russell, No. 124 Wentworth-street, This Afternoon, at three o'clock. (Wednesday, March 9, 1814.)

On Thursday the 24th of February, departed this life, Mrs. Martha Neely, widow of the Rev. Thomas Neely, deceased, in the 38th year of her age, leaving three children and a large number of friends and neighbors to mourn their irreparable loss.

Died, in England Nov. 16th William Franklin, Esq. formerly the British Governor of New Jersey, in North America, aged 82 years. He was son of the celebrated Dr. Benjamin Franklin.

#### For the City Gazette

On the Death of Miss Laura R. Nowell, who departed this life on the 27th ult. How unrelenting Death to mortals prove,/How dispossess'd of pity, fear or love;/Respects no beauty, nor the parent's tear,/But sweeps sweet Laura in her seventh year. . . . (Saturday, March 12, 1814.)

Married, on Thursday evening, the 10th inst. by the Rev. Christopher Gadsden, Mr. James S. Singleton, of Sumter District, to Miss Louisa Belser, of this city. (Friday, March 18, 1814.)

. . . In the death of Mrs. Violetta Frampton, who died on the 4th inst. a chasm has been created in the circle of her acquaintance.

By her departure from this vale of tears and transitory state of exitance a weeping husband, brother, sisters and numerous relations and friends have been deprived of her who was wont to charm and improve them by the sweetness of her disposition [long eulogy] (Saturday March 19, 1814).

The Friends and Acquaintances of Mr. James Delaire, are requested to attend his Funeral This Afternoon, at 3 o'clock, from his late residence, No. 166, East-Bay-continued. (Friday March 25, 1814.)

The Friends and Acquaintances of Mr. George Hoffman [blurred] are requested to attend the Funeral of Mrs. Maria Hoffman, This Afternoon at four o'clock, from No. 38, Elliott-street, next door to the corner of Church-street. (Saturday March 26, 1814.)

Died, on the 26th instant, in the 47th year of his age, Alexander Inglis, Esq. (Wednesday, March 30, 1814.)

Departed this life on the 25th ult. perfectly resigned to the will of his Maker, Capt. William Brown, aged 46 years and 6 months, for twenty years past a master of a packet in the Savannah trade. He was a tender and indulgent husband, a kind master, and possessed a sympathizing and feeling heart, which was ever ready to relieve the distressed. . . . (Saturday April 2, 1814.)

Departed this life on the 26th ult. Alexander Inglis, Esq., in the 48th year of his age. For several years he had been afflicted with an excruciating disorder, which continually tormented his existence. He was kind and affectionate to his immediate relations. . . .

Died, on the 24th ult. in the 70 year of his age, Mr. James Delaire formerly a respectable merchant at Cape Francois, St. Domingo, and for upwards of twenty years a resident of this city. (Wednesday, April 6 1814.)

Died, in this city, on the 25th ult. aged 23, Mrs. Maria Hoffman, consort of Mr. George Hoffman; a lady possessing all the exemplary qualifications so endearing to a husband and friends, . . . (Saturday April 9, 1814.)

Married, on 9th instant, by the Rev. Dr. Furman, Mr. Henry Canaday, of this place, to Mrs. Martha S. Scott, of Edisto-Island.

Died, on the 31st ult. at the house of Capt. Francis Saltus, Prince William's Parish, in the 34th year of his age, after a severe illness of 21 days, George Yuille MacMurphy, Esq. of Edgefield

District, and late Adjutant of the 1st regt. of militia, recently in service on the sea board. He left a wife and three infant children to deplore their irreparable loss. . . . His body was interred in Sheldon Church Yard on the 1st April, with military honors; and the officers of the 20th regt. in the vicinity of that place, resolved, in respect to his memory to wear military mourning one month after his decease. (Thursday, April 14, 1814.)

*(To be continued)*

## JOURNAL OF GENERAL PETER HORRY

Edited by A. S. SALLEY

(Continued from January issue)

Sunday July 26<sup>th</sup>. 1812—Rode out this morning (very Cool) Tra-  
pier Sent me 4 Ch<sup>s</sup>. Ton News Papers, w<sup>e</sup>. I read but tis plain 'tis  
a Federal Paper.<sup>1</sup> Contains much in favour of the English but  
nothing in favour of France or America—A Republican Paper  
will just reverse this just mentioned Recital—Pity Party Spirit  
Prevails so much in our Country—War ought to burry all distinc-  
tions & all Combine in Union & harmony but different men will  
have different minds—If we are Invaded I doubt not all will be  
United under American Standard—I find Commodore Rogers has  
taken no Part of the Jamaica Fleet, but has Injured a British Ship  
of War. Killed & Wounded Several of her Sailors—Halifax, must  
be taken—Yankees this must be your [16] Portion of Conquest. the  
Middle department will take Canady. & the we the Southern de-  
partment will take the Floridas, & Mexico.—No Acco<sup>t</sup>. of Captain  
Gasqua & his Wife Coming to Reside w<sup>h</sup>. me. I hope he has Gone  
for her, is the Reason I hear nothing of them as yet—nor of his  
Company coming to Encamp near my House—I Looked for Return  
of my boat today, but in Vain—

Monday—Early this morning before I was up. the arrival of my  
boat was Announced to me, & when I Returned from Riding I  
received Sundrie Supplies; Chiefly Vegetables from Dovers Garden<sup>2</sup>  
—I also Received a Letter from M<sup>r</sup>. Davis & a Letter from M<sup>r</sup>.  
Williams (my Overseer) from the former I received a present of  
Apples, she Informs me of the Arrival of Cap<sup>t</sup> Smith from the  
W<sup>t</sup> Indies Oranges, Limes & c<sup>e</sup>. & that a M<sup>r</sup>. Cunningham & 2  
Souldiers have Died in George Town Since her Last Letter to  
me. (Note) George Town must be [17] now very hot, Since I find  
it here very warm—My Overseer Sent me—Several Bushels of

<sup>1</sup> Probably *Charleston Courier*. Its proprietor, A. S. Willington, was a New  
Englander and a Federalist.

<sup>2</sup> Horry's garden at Dover plantation on Winyah Bay.

Rice Tailings<sup>3</sup> for my Poultry & he denies any knowledge of his Going to be Married to Miss Carville—(a handsome young Girl at George Town, that Lives w<sup>h</sup>. her Mother on the Bay) None Sick at Dover, or Brown Town house; Peggy's youngest Child (a fine Little Girl M<sup>rs</sup>. Davis writes me—Creeps about fast. I wish she may survive this fall—My Ducks here Thrives very much & is fat, I wish I could Say the same of my fowles & hogs. Mules, Cow & Calf. they decline in Looks tho' my mules yet draws me along thro heavy sand twice a Day. but I feed them twice a Day w<sup>h</sup> Corn, & fodder at Night, besides the marsh w<sup>e</sup>. they feed on—the Greatest part of the day—dined on apple Dumplins & a Pollow<sup>4</sup> today—dont fare so well every day. tho' my Kind Little Relation M<sup>rs</sup>. Trapier,<sup>5</sup> Sends me many dainties by her handy house maids—poor Nemo, Ben's Right hand Man is Quite a Cripple [18] with the Rhumatis—we live here in a Low damp & Wet Country & a Warm one it is so Lyable to Colds, w<sup>e</sup>. brings on many Complaints we seem not aware off. tho' Experience ought to Teach us Wisdom—but we follow the Good old book, w<sup>e</sup>. Says sufficient is the Evil unto the day thereof—Wind very high at N°. East for Sometime past & now tis heavy, Drisling Cloudy weather—I Look for a heavy Gale from the N° East, or East Quarter & directly from Sea—So Marriners on our Coasts. be Vigilent on board your Vessells Keep all lights & Sails Close reefed & Bowlings all Clear, boats Secured on Deck & Experienced men, at your helm & Good Night Watch, & Lights in Benecles—to See your Compass—& then I & you will Expect to Weather all—Sailors is Like Souldiers—Sometimes Lead Lazy Lives & Sometimes, hard times Overtakes them & dangers & difficulties Succeeds—but hearts of Oak my brave Lads. Stand to it & trust to him that made you, we must all Die—[19] but be Comforted for we Cant die before our times

<sup>3</sup> In the process of winnowing the chaff and broken pieces of straw from rough rice small particles of rice and the "flour", or brand, that lies next to the grain, are broken off and are blown out with the chaff. This furnishes pickings for poultry and hogs and it is called tailings.

<sup>4</sup> Pilau. Rice cooked (South Carolina style) with chicken, ham, fish, shrimp etc.; also with tomatoes, okra, etc., frequently spiced.

<sup>5</sup> General Horry's aunt, Magdalen Horry, married Paul Trapier. Their son, Paul Trapier, married, November 19, 1771, Elizabeth Foissin. He died in 1778 and in 1784 his widow married Albert Roux. This Mrs. Trapier was necessarily the wife of a grandson of Gen. Horry's aunt.

are Come 'tis Decreed & then we Go. to a Land of Rest. free from all Cares & Trouble for Evermore amen—This afternoon about 2 OClock discovered a 3 Mast Vessell Standin for the Light House could discover that her Colors was hoisted but could not discover of what Nation about 4 OClock PM. She Stood of to the Eastward & Soon was out of Sight, I Suppose her of force & Cruising on our Coast to Meet an Enemies Vessel—I hope She is an American—

Tuesday. Rode out S<sup>o</sup> W<sup>d</sup>. & brought home a Load of wood—Expect Capt<sup>t</sup> Guasqua's Compy to Encamp near me today, Lessesne beef very Good, Dined on Roast Beef & Bake Pears &c. the Last sent me by M<sup>rs</sup>. Trapier who with her husband Visited me today w<sup>h</sup>. their Son Horry Trapier, I would be bad off was it not for the friend [20] friendship of this Family. in return for the many things I Receive from them—I am able only to send them Water melons Sometimes—M<sup>rs</sup>. Lessesne has not yet Visited me as she Said she would d<sup>o</sup>—Today Major Murray & his family are Expected at their New House here—We I hope will be Sociable Good Neighbours, they are next in my estimation to Trapiers family—Scipio Drawed Shrimps, Mullets & Crabs in the Bason & with these Caught Whiting, Crocus, & Cat fishes in the Inlet—having now a suitable Boat & Seine—I hope never to want fish of all Kinds—when tis Good Weather—Note the weather for Several days Past very Cool, I Suppose a Gale at Sea. from the Eastward I Sleep well at Nights. Go to bed a 8 OClock P.M. & Rise at 5 OClock—The Beach is now Low both Morning & Evenings fine & hard & Good Riding. my Tailings Saves me much Corn w<sup>c</sup>. my Ducks & fowls Used to Devour Greedily—[21] this evening Saw Major Murray, he told me all his family was in his House, that Miss Delesseline was so reduced I would not know her & Invited me to Breakfast w<sup>h</sup>. her tomorrow Morning Saw also Doctor Wragg, who Informed me That Capt<sup>n</sup>. Gasqua would not be Down before Thursday next—

Wednesday. I rode out & Got some wood—my Tailings very bad wrote Overseer for better, & Sent M<sup>rs</sup>. Davis Some fish by boat w<sup>c</sup>. will Go up on Friday/as my Servant Jemo appears better, & Says his bowel Complaint at Night is not so bad as it has been—he Eats & walks about more than Usual during the day, Put on my Sundays apparel & went & breakfasted w<sup>h</sup>. Major Murray. took Some buisket w<sup>h</sup>. me Least Murray should have none very

low Tide this morning. tho' the wind is at the East tis almost a Calm, Scipio went w<sup>h</sup>. me to Major Murray to assist my Getting out of my Carriage—about 10 OClock [22] A:M: Returned Home—had the Seine Drawed in the Bason, Caught only a few very Small Mullets—

Saw at Murrays Miss Delesseline She Looks better than I Expected, She is in Spirits & Taking Jesuits Bark Manning is her Phisition—I jested her much of young Cockley (a Militia Officer Encampt near the Light house w<sup>h</sup> a number of men—& I find her Not averse to this Officers making Love to her—I Saw Also at Murrays, Charles Lessesne Quarter Master to Our Militia detatchment on the Winyaw<sup>6</sup> Islands—he has made Choice of a Spot of Encampment for Gasquas Company (w<sup>o</sup>. has 2 Subalterns under his Command) near the Inlet & to Major Wrags house on the Point & just within the first Range of Hills nearest the Sea—but says they cannot come there till his supply of Provisions arrives from Ch<sup>s</sup>. Town<sup>7</sup> by the first fair Wind [23] Lessesne, Peter Cuttino, & Murray all say they Know M<sup>r</sup>s. Gasqua. that She is of a Cooper Family of the Irish Township<sup>8</sup>—I say this Family I well Knew in the Revolutionary War. & they are very Respectable; They further say. She M<sup>r</sup>s. G. is a well bred & Agreeable Woman —so I Anticipate much pleasure in her Company & the Captain & his Officers; Lessesne & Cuttino took Leave of this Family ab<sup>s</sup>. 1 OClock P.M. & went off as did Also myself—on my way home I met with Tho<sup>s</sup>. R Mitchell Esq<sup>r</sup> he was Engaged at Dinner but would a Little time hence Call At my House; I offer<sup>d</sup>, him a Room & bed for Lodgings at any time; he said he would Make Use of Such a Privaledge sometimes—I Saw the Spot designed for Gasquas Comp<sup>y</sup>; Mitchell I saw again today & he then Said he would Call on me on the Morrow—Major Keith in his Carriage Visited Trapier who I Saw but [24] did not See the Major—

(To be continued)

<sup>6</sup> Winyah. The second syllable should not be given the aw sound. Most early spellings indicate that the sound was softer, and that yah was more nearly the phonetic interpretation. The Winyah islands are North Island, South Island and Cat Island. There are some little islands in the bay called on the map in Mills's *Atlas of South Carolina Marsh Islands and Rabbit Island*.

<sup>7</sup> He could not overcome the old habit of writing it Charles Town, the name it bore to August 13, 1783, when, by an Act of the General Assembly, it was incorporated and its name changed to Charleston.

<sup>8</sup> Williamsburg Township.

GRAVE STONE INSCRIPTIONS FROM FAMILY  
CEMETERIES IN MARION COUNTY

Contributed by VICTOR B. STANLEY, JR.

Sacred / to the memory of / Francis Davis / who was born on February 18th 1779 / and died January 27th 1837.

Sacred / to the memory of / Argent Davis / wife of Francis Davis / who was born on January 1st 1781 / and died December 2nd 1844.

Sacred / to the memory of Elizabeth Graves, / daughter of Francis and Argent Davis / Born March 22 1817 / Died April 2, 1817.

Sacred / to the memory of Elizabeth Jane Davis / Born June 5th 1820 / Died November 3, 1820.

Sacred / to the memory of / Ann Giles Davis / daughter of Francis and Argent Davis / Born April 21, 1824 / Died October 26, 1824.

Sacred / to the memory of William M. Davis / Son of Francis and Argent Davis / Born August 12, 1813 / Died August 20 / 1813. (The above inscriptions were copied from a deserted cemetery several miles from a highway in Britton's Neck, Marion County, S. C.)

In Memory of / Mrs. Sarah B. Wood / who departed from her residence on earth / in hope of eternal life in Heaven / on the 17th day of September, 1833 / aged 88 Years. / This stone is erected by her daughter / Martha Le Gette / as a tribute of affection.

Martha Wood Snow / daughter of James and A. W. Snow / yielded up her little life at the dawn of / Sabbath 22nd July 1849 / aged 4 Years. Sweet bud of promise / Thy petals shall unfold in Paradise / Thy home is with the angels / Come to God to bloom all thy freshness.

Here / lies the young Elizabeth Ann Le Gette / who departed this life / in hope of eternal rest in Heaven / on the 7th of July, 1843 / aged 16 Years, 4 Months, and 20 Days. / She was a member of the Church / and died as she had lived / a Christian. / This stone is erected / by her affectionate parents / as a token for her many amiable qualities. / Friend after friend departeth.

Sacred / To the Memory of / The Rev. Jesse Le Gette / who departed this life / June 5th A. D. 1828 / in the 54th year of his age / He was a zealous advocate of the doctrine of the Methodist Episcopal Church / An affectionate husband and a fond father / A generous and devoted friend / And intimately distinguished for his genuine hospitality / Thou dear departed friend—Supremely blest / From care thou dost in Jesus Bosom rest. / We loved and revered thee with affection deep / and feel tis sacred where thy ashes rest /

In this same cemetery there is a broken tomb to Martha Wood Le Gette, daughter of Jesse Wood and Sarah B. Wood, and wife of Rev. Jesse Le Gette. She was born in 1780 and died in 1841. There is another grave unmarked but said to be that of a small boy, Cruch Le Gette.

(These inscriptions were copied from the Le Gette Family Cemetery on China Grove Plantation near Centenary, Marion County, S. C.)

COPY OF FAMILY RECORDS FROM BIBLE OF JOHN  
MAYNARD DAVIS

Contributed by EMMA C. RICHARDSON

Frances Davis—died 17th September 1796 / Aged 67 years /  
was buried in St Phillips Church new Church yard /

Hannah Baker (her Daughter) died in Charleston / November  
1798, and was buried near her mother /

Ann Moore died 29 July 1798 /

Ann Bower (Elizabeth) say Eliz Bower / Died in Charleston  
20th August 1800 /

Joseph Moore died in Charleston 17th September 1813 /

Catherine Ireson Davis, died 12th January 1811 /

Cordelia Strobel died 25 June 1813 /

John Maynard Davis died May 27th 1827 / 71 years & 13 days /

John Maynard Davis }  
and } Were Married

Mary Eliza Moncrief }

in Charleston, So. Carolina, by the Revd / Geo. Buist of the Pres-  
byterian Church on the 26th day / of September in the Year of  
Our Lord 1793 /

Thomas Davis Baker—was born— / in Exeter Gr. Britain 20th  
July 1794 /

Catherine Ireson Davis / was born in London 14th Febr 1792 /  
(the adopted daughter of J M & M E Davis)

Cordelia Strobel, daughter of Martin and / Eliza Strobel, was  
born in Charleston South / Carolina, on the 1st day of September  
1810 / at 12 O Clock (noon)— /

Married on the 12 of December 1844 by the / Revd John Bach-  
mann R H Strobel to Miss Amelia / Davis, Charleston South  
Carolina /

Mary Eliza Strobel was born on the 9 of May / 1848 at 10 O  
Clock A M /

Arthur Markley Strobel son of R H and / Amelia D Strobel was  
born on the 31st of / January 1852 between the hours of 12 &  
1 O Clock Noon /

